

Beginning of The Bhagavad Gītā with reference to the fourth gospel

This title was preceded by

The teachings of Jesus Christ applied to the attitude of
the United States toward other nations

Moral motive and the ethics of Jesus

Rich and poor in Jewish and Christian apocalyptic
literature

The messiahship in the mind of Jesus

The theology of Sir Henry Jones

The text and language of the New Testament

Search by above titles on archive.org to
continue reading this collection of Pacific
School of Religion Theses from 1925
call number Thesis Cage 1925 v.2



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2025 with funding from
Graduate Theological Union

<https://archive.org/details/bhagavadgtwithre00unse>

THE BHAGAVAD GĪTĀ
With Reference To
THE FOURTH GOSPEL.

By

MOOLAMANNIL OOMMEN THOMAS

B. A. (With Honours), Madras University, 1919

M. A., Madras University, 1921

S. T. B., Hartford Theological Seminary, 1923

THESIS

Submitted in the department of the History
of Religions in partial fulfilment of the
requirements of the degree of Doctor of
Theology in Pacific School of Religion

1925.

PREFACE.

The search for the Unseen Reality has been carried on in all ages and in all lands. That which baffled the metaphysician and the philosopher has often been grasped in essence by the bhaktas (devotees). The two books that we shall discuss in the following pages would amply illustrate this fact.

Intolerance is a great virtue as well as vice of religious people. Religion in its attempt to shut out evil has often shut out the good as well. In its hatred of compromise, it has refused to 'test all and retain what is good.' Most religious people live on the assumption that they have the sole monopoly of truth, and that they alone possess whatever is good and beautiful. Hence they have denied themselves the benefit of an impartial study of truth in other quarters.

The attempt of the present writer lies in the direction of bringing out the close similarity that exists between the two great devotional books of two great religions. I shall try to show that they are far from being contradictory. On the other hand, they supplement each other. Those who would want to understand the heart of the Fourth Gospel cannot hope to do so without understanding "The Flower of the Sanskrit Literature", and vice versa.

The study of the two books has been immensely interesting to the writer. Here, I must humbly acknowledge the invaluable suggestions that have come from Professor Saunders. In fact, my thesis would never have taken its present form without the great help that Professor Saunders rendered. I must also gratefully acknowledge the inspiration and instruction that I have received from my New Testament Professors Dean Jacobus

of Hartford and Doctor C. C. McCown, in the study of the Fourth Gospel. My humble thanks are due also to Professor Ryder of the University of California for the instruction in Sanskrit and general Hindoo Literature. The use of the library of the United Thological College, Bangalore, was the greatest help to my study of the *Gitā* while I was in India.

Among the books I have consulted, Radhakrishna's "Indian Philosophy", Tattavabhusan's "Krishna and the *Gitā*," and E. F. Scott's "Fourth Gospel," need special mention, because they were of the greatest help to me. I have generally used Mrs. Besant's translation of the *Gitā*, Hume's translation of the Upanisads, and A. A. McDonell's translations of the Rg-Veda. For the rest of the translations I have generally used the "Sacred Books of the East" series. The bibliography and the list of abbreviations are given at the end.

M. O. T.

CONTENTS.

	Pages.
Introduction.	1-12.
Chapter 1. The Purpose, The Process and The Elements of The Gitā.....	13-28.
Chapter 2. The Analyses of the Gitā and the Fourth Gospel.....	29-42.
Chapter 3. The Kṛṣṇa of the Gitā and the Christ of the Fourth Gospel.....	43-61.
Chapter 4. The Eternal Order -- The Brahman and the Logos.....	62-79.
Chapter 5. Bhakti Mārga -- The Way of Loving Devotion.....	80-95.
Chapter 6. Jñāna Mārga -- The Way of Intuitive Knowledge.....	96-107.
Chapter 7. Karma Mārga -- The Way of Works...	108-121.
Chapter 8. The Goal..... Bibliography.	122-141.

Introduction.

In the field of religious devotional literature, there are three outstanding books -- The ^dSadharma Pundarīka of the Full Mahāyāna Buddhism, The Bhagavad Gītā of the Hindoos, and The Fourth Gospel of the Christian Church. There is every reason to suppose that they were produced more or less at the same time by men who felt the same kind of need. In that they are alike. But their backgrounds, surroundings, and circumstances were different. Hence in a great measure they cannot but differ from each other. Whether they influenced one another or not is a question that we shall not discuss here. However, we may mention that whether there were mutual influences or not, they are so much alike in very many of their cardinal points.

In the present work, I shall consider two of these books -- The Bhagavad Gītā and The Fourth Gospel.

The Fourth Gospel is a well-known book in the West. Its origin, authorship, date etc are sufficiently discussed by Christian theologians. Hence I feel it superfluous to enter into a similar task in this short work. Therefore, these topics shall be discussed only in connection with the Gītā.

1. The Traditional Origin of the Bhagavad Gītā.

The popular tradition about the Gītā is that it was spoken on the holy Kurukṣetra by Kṛṣṇa to Arjuna.

This tradition adds to its popularity and charm. But the critical scholarship of the Hindoos as well as others has shown that this belief of the Hindoo world is without any

real foundation. Kṛṣṇa and Arjuna are most probably historical persons; Kurukṣetra is a historical spot. But their combination and connection with the great inspired book (of the Hindoo religious literature) is as far as one can see mythical and legendary.

However, the book itself in its completed form is largely responsible for this traditional belief. Kṛṣṇa and Arjuna figure very prominently. The first few chapters at least are intimately associated with the battle of Kurukṣetra. The account is as follows.

At the holy Kurukṣetra, there drew out in battle array great armies of two sets of cousins belonging to the Lunar Line, the Kurus and the Pāndus. Kurus (hundred brothers) were the sons of Dhritarāṣṭra, and the Pāndus were the sons of Pāndu, Dhritarāṣṭra's brother. The battle arose on account of the fact that the Kurus tried to keep the Pāndus out of their rightful inheritance. The most valiant fighter and hero among the Pāndus is Arjuna. His charioteer is Kṛṣṇa. On the field of battle, Arjuna looks across the army of the enemies and finds among them not only his cousins, but also "uncles, grand-fathers, teachers, mother's brothers, sons, grand-sons, comrades, fathers-in-law, benefactors, and other relatives." At this sight Arjuna becomes very much dejected. He is deeply moved to pity at the thought that he has to kill all of them before he could win the battle. Hence he says "seeing these kinsmen, O Kṛṣṇa, arrayed, eager to fight, my limbs fail, and my mouth is parched, my body quivers, and my hair stands on end, gāndiva slips from my hand, and my skin burns all over, I am not able to stand, my mind is whirling, and I see adverse omens, O Kesiava. Nor do

I forsee any advantage from slaying kinsmen in battle. For I desire not victory, O Kṛṣṇa, nor kingdom, nor pleasures; what is Kingdom to us, O Govinda, what enjoyment, or even life? 1:29-32.

Thus overcame by despondency he refuses to fight. But Kṛṣṇa urges him to fight on the ground that he being a Kṣattriya, and the war being a righteous one, it is his duty to fight.

The Bhagavad Gītā thus appears as a part of the sixth book of the Mahābhārata in the form of a dialogue between Kṛṣṇa and Arjuna, the immediate subject matter of which is duty.

This connection largely accounts for the traditional belief of its origin and we shall see in the sequel that it is unfounded.

2. The True Origin of The Gītā.

The place that the Gītā occupies in the epic does not furnish us with the true origin of the Gītā. It lies elsewhere far removed from the trumpets of war and ^{the} of battle. It has nothing to do with "conches and kettle-drums, tabors, drums and cowhorns." In the quiet inner solitude of a devout soul, longing for the saving power of the Divine Being, we find the true origin not only of the Gītā, but of every great religious work.

The old Sāstras failed at least in their old forms. The polytheistic conception did not meet the requirements of the thinking people. Men were losing faith in Indra, Sūrya, Ushas and a host of other gods and goddesses.

A new philosophy arose. It did satisfy the mind. It gave a splendid account of the Ultimate Reality. But unfortunately it did not have enough stuff in it to satisfy the heart-hunger of the common man. The total impression that the Upanisads left on the average man who craved for God was not altogether

satisfactory. The Ultimate Reality was cold and feelingless. The idea of a Brahman who is in the main impersonal while satisfying the intellect did not satisfy the emotional side of man. As Macnicol puts it, "The stuff was too stubborn for religious consciousness; it cannot mould it near enough to the heart's desire." (Indian Theism.)

The Vedic conception satisfied the heart, while the Upanisadic conception mainly satisfied the mind. But religion cannot be onesided. How to find God who would satisfy the requirements of the head as well as the heart was the problem of the philosophically-minded spiritual people. ^{The} Gitā is an attempt in this direction.

Again, the avatāra conception was one that was attractive to the Indian mind. Whenever there was decay of righteousness and an exaltation of unrighteousness ^{if taught,} God himself came down to deliver the world. The time was ready for the undercurrent of monotheism in the Hindoo religion to come to the surface and have an uninterrupted flow. For the first time in the religious history of India, God became definitely embodied in a grand central figure of moral and spiritual excellence -- a person in whom worshippers found satisfaction of their hearts' hunger. Who else could this figure be except an incarnation of the old Vedic god Visnu?

Visnu was still held in reverence and devotion by a large number of people. How he alone among other gods came to occupy such a great position is partly explained by legends and partly by his own nature. Besides the stories about him and his avatāre, the nature of his avatāra, his willingness to descend to earth

his self-emptying to become man, and the promise of eternal life in him bound the hearts of the spiritually-minded people to him in bhakti. They looked up to him as their God and Saviour.

Here lies the true origin of the Bhagavad Gītā. Vāsudeva-Kṛṣṇa who was considered as a deity was identified with Vishnu, and was taken to be an avatāra of the latter. Who Vāsudeva-Kṛṣṇa really is and how he came to hold such an exalted position, we shall consider at length in a later chapter. ^{The} Gītā was originally written in the interest of upholding the claims of this incarnate saviour.

3. The Date of The Bhagavad Gītā.

Nothing can definitely be settled about the date of any early Indian literature. Hence we are almost at a complete loss when we try to fix the exact date of the Gītā. All that we can do in this direction is guess work.

The date of the Gītā is bound up with the date of the Mahābhārata. It is not possible for us to examine the latter. The Mahābhārata is a composite work of many hands and of different periods. Judging from the character and the contents of the Gītā we have to conclude that it is not one of the early productions among the various parts of the epic, but one of the very late ones. The Gītā's association with the battle of Kurukṣetra is seen already to be unfounded and hence its date could not coincide with the date of the war. Perhaps, a thousand years or even more lie between the date of the war and that of the Gītā.

The war probably took place during the latter part of the Mantra period, when the Vedic hymns were being compiled or had just been compiled. The Gītā cannot have been composed earlier

than the Dharmā Śāstra period which began about 200 B. C. This is the view of a modern critic of the Gītā -- Sitanath Tattava-bhushan. He supports his position both by negative and positive evidence. As negative evidence he argues that the Gītā which has had such a wide and deep influence on the national character and the literature of the Hindoos is not even mentioned in the first four periods of the literary history -- the Māntra, the Brāhmaṇa, the Upaniṣad, and the Śāstra periods. The positive evidence lies in the fact that the ideas found in the Gītā could be held only by a writer well-versed in the literature of the periods mentioned. Moreover, almost all classes of that great literature are distinctly mentioned by him. Therefore, Tattava-bhushan concludes that the Gītā which is commonly believed to be the utterance of Kṛṣṇa on the holy Kurukṣetra at a battle that was fought during the Mantra period really comes down to a time which cannot be earlier than the beginning of the Dharmā Śāstra period, and that is a little before or after the beginning of the Christian era.

On the other hand, there are those who hold that the Gītā was completed and assumed its present form in the days of Patañjali, who was probably a contemporary of Gotama Buddha. Radhakrishnan in his recent book on "Indian Philosophy" assigns the date of the Gītā to the fifth century B. C. He supports his position by the following arguments. He says that there are internal references to the Bhagavad Gītā in the Mahābhārata which clearly indicate that from the time of the composition of the Mahābhārata the Gītā has been looked upon as a genuine part of it. Again, he holds that since there are stylistic resemblances between the Gītā and the Mahābhārata they belong to one whole. Moreover, he

thinks that there is agreement in the main views of the two books about systems of philosophy and religion.

The first two arguments of Radhakrishnan are nullified by the fact of his own statement later that the *Mahābhārata* is a composite work of many hands and of different periods, and hence the arguments of the internal references and of the resemblance in style could not rest on secure foundation. With regard to the agreement on the main views, it is probable that the author of the *Gītā*, who is well-versed in the Indian literature, borrowed it from the epic.

Telang holds that the *Gītā* belongs to a period earlier than the third century B. C. R. G. Bhandārkar thinks that it is at least as old as the fourth century B. C. Garbe assigns the original *Gītā* to 200 B. C. and the completed form to 200 A. D.

Such are the conflicting views about the date of the *Gītā*. There is no satisfactory theory on the subject. In the absence of any conclusive evidence as to the date on the part of others, we might hold our own theory.

We may safely hold that the *Gītā* is later than most of the *Upaniṣads*, because the doctrine of grace and *upāsana* (*chakti*) that are found in the *Upaniṣads* in germ are fully developed in the *Gītā*. Some hold that the *Gītā* is a late *Upaniṣad*. It is in fact also named *Bhagavadgītāpaniṣad*.

The original *Gītā*, which is in all probability a theistic poem, perhaps is as old as the fourth century B. C. if not earlier. The second edition of it may fall in the second century B. C. But the date of the completed *Gītā*, I am inclined to hold with beginning of the Tattava mission, lies somewhere around the Christian era. Most probably it falls after Christ than before him.

Some of the greatest events in the world's history run parallel. The age of Herakleitos of Greece, of the great prophets of Israel, of Buddha in India lies more or less in the same century. So also, the great popular demand for a personal saviour was felt and finally met during the course of the first or the second century A. D. The universal tendency for deifying a hero, a sage, or a great religious reformer ran parallel about this time in ^{many of} ~~all~~ the then existing great religions. The date of the Fourth Gospel that has a more pronounced deifying tendency than any other written records of the life of Christ is, as far as we know, either the end of the first or the beginning of the second century A. D. Gotama Buddha was not worshipped immediately after his death. It took four or five centuries before he finally became the god of the Buddhists. Buddha's deification was a great factor in the universal acceptance of a grand central figure in Hindooism. The completed *Gita* arose out of the necessity to withstand the claims of a rival, and that rival never appeared to be so threatening to Hindooism as he did around the Christian era.

Moreover, we hear echoes of Buddhism here and there in the *Gita*, though we cannot be quite sure whether it is an echo or an independent voice of the *Gita* itself. The attitude of Arjuna towards war and killing is perhaps a ~~—~~ reflex of Asoka. *Ahimsa* and detachment are supposed to be borrowed from Buddhism. But they need not necessarily be so, since any right-minded man, even a *Kshattrija*, would shrink from unnecessary shedding of blood especially of his relatives, friends, and gurus. Further, the principle of *ahimsa* and detachment are not altogether absent from the early Hindoo literature. It is admitted, of course, on

all sides that the completed *Gītā* is the work of a period after Sākyamuni. But the conversation between Kṛṣṇa and Arjuna about battle and bloodshed most probably belonged to the original of the *Mahābhārata* which is much earlier than the time of Sākyamuni. If that be so, the argument of the Asokan influence does not carry much weight.

Another consideration in the matter of the date is the *Lotus Scripture* of the *Mahāyāna* Buddhism. Buddha was, no doubt, worshipped as *Devātideva* even before the *Lotus Scripture* came into existence, and it was a book written to uphold his claim. There need not be any hesitation in saying that the author of the *Lotus Scripture*^t was acquainted with the *Gītā*, in which case the *Gītā* must have been a little earlier than the *Lotus* which came into existence about the first century A. D. The *Gītā* and the *Lotus* had a race on parallel lines to gain adherents. But the *Gītā* had an earlier and a better start. It did incorporate in itself most of the things that were very attractive in *Mahāyāna*. Hence the *Mahāyāna* Buddhism had to give way before the more complete synthesis of the *Gītā*.

Kṛṣṇa, a deified hero, and the *Vāsudeva-Kṛṣṇa* of the *Bhāgavata* religion were combined and ~~was~~ accepted as the final *avatāra* of *Viṣṇu*, meeting the needs of a sin-stricken world, and the *Gītā* assumed its final form about the end of the first century A. D.

4. The Authorship of the *Gītā*.

We are as much in the dark about the authorship of the *Gītā* as we are ~~of~~^{about} its date. Tradition assigns it ^{to} one *Vyāsa* who wrote it

down as Kṛṣṇa spoke to Arjuna on the battlefield. Perhaps the book itself is responsible for this tradition. It states in 18: 74-75 "Sanjaya said, 'I heard the marvellous dialogue of Vāsudeva and the great-souled Pārtha, causing my hair to stand on end. By favour of Vyāsa, I listened to this secret and supreme yoga from the Lord of the Yoga, Kṛṣṇa himself speaking before mine eyes.'". But it is highly improbable that such a person as Vyāsa wrote the poem, even if he ever existed. To grant that such a conversation took place at the eve of a great battle, and that there was a person to write it down at such an early date is to do violence to our historic sense. Moreover, we have already seen that about a thousand years lie between the battle of Kurukṣetra and the date of the Gītā.

Who, then, is the author ~~is, a factor~~ ^{at least} that nobody knows. The Gītā is most probably the work of ^{at least} three men of three different periods.

1. The original poem which must have been purely theistic is the work of some devout individual who felt the need of a personal saviour and upheld the claims of a deified religious sage and reformer.

2. The second edition of it was, in all likelihood, by a man of deep culture and well-versed in the philosophy of the ~~Upaniṣads~~, and in the epic. The Gītā's dramatic setting, (suggested, probably, by a simile in Kāthāpaniṣad, and the conversation between Kṛṣṇa and Arjuna in the Mahābhārata) and many of its upaniṣadic elements might have come from the hands of this second author.

3. Then, came Buddhism, a great rival on the field. Any religion is forced to revise its creed on the appearance of a ~~dangerous~~

rival. Therefore, a third man, probably a Brahman less inclined to be spiritual and more with a spirit of compromise, taking the poem, made a large synthesis as to include everything in it, even the Sāṅkhyā atheism and the Vedic polytheism. Thus after the final edition of it was made there was not much in the Hindoo thought that the Gītā did not include.

The question arises, if Kṛṣṇa did not speak and no-body wrote it down, and if we take it to be the work of an individual of deep spiritual experience, how is it possible that he could compose a work of this sort and let the world believe that those are the divine words of One who actually spoke? In other words how can a man record the outcome of his own thought and imagination as the words of the Almighty God? How could he write something himself and let the posterity believe that it was God himself who spoke?

Here, we must understand that all truly religious and prophetic literature is of this type. In the prophetic books of the Old Testament it is not the prophets, but Yahweh that speaks. The prophets are only the inspired mediums to carry the message. To some extent the Fourth Gospel has more or less the same attitude. The author is an inspired man. It is not all that Jesus has actually spoken that the author has recorded, but what the writer thought, or rather felt he knew that Jesus spoke. There was no intention of perpetrating a fraud.

With regard to the Gītā, we have also to take into consideration its own standpoint as well as its spiritual and philosophical backgrounds. The representation of the individual as identical with the Universal Self is found almost everywhere in the Hindoo thought, especially in the Upaniṣads and more especially in

the Chāndogya and the Brhadāraṇyaka. The sage who comes to a knowledge of the true Self, who realises the Ātman, identifies himself with the Universal Self, and he speaks from the stand-point of that Self. This may sound ridiculous to those who have not realised the Ātman. What the author of the Gītā does is to assume this standpoint, and attribute the outcome of his own thoughts to Kṛṣṇa whom he worshipped and considered as his God and Saviour. He was presenting a saviour to the world, and if ^{that} he spoke, he would have spoken in the words of the Gītā is the assumption of the author.

Chapter 1.

The Purpose, The Process, and The Elements of The Gītā.

The Bhagavad Gītā answers a need that was all along felt by the religious-minded Hindoos. It is a book that teaches lessons in religion and morality first, and secondly lessons in philosophy. Yet it is considered not as a śruti, or revealed scripture, (inspite of the great revelation that Kṛṣṇa makes to Arjuna) but as a smṛti, or tradition. Its original purpose is clear and its real message very simple. It is to uphold the claims of a personal saviour to a sin-stricken world -- a saviour who incarnated himself to put down unrighteousness and to uphold righteousness, to teach dharma, the way of bhakti, and of jñāna, and to point out the goal. These factors stand ^{out} very prominently. It was to open a way by which not only the rich and the cultured could obtain salvation, but also the poor and the unintelligent, the high caste and the low caste, the meek and the lowly can have a place in the 'kingdom of God.' In this it has a real ^{ly} great message for those who have a heart's hunger for spiritual things.

But the original purpose of the Gītā is sometimes obscured during the process of its development, so that there are various conflicting views about it. We may mention some of them. Holtzmann holds that the Gītā is a Viṣṇuaite remodelling of a pantheistic poem. Hopkins is of opinion that it is a Kṛṣṇite version of an older Viṣṇuaite poem which in turn was a late Upaniṣad. Deussen suggests that it is a late product of the degeneration of the monistic thought of the Upaniṣads representing a period of transition from theism to realistic atheism.

Garbe thinks that it is a text-book of the Bhāgavatas revised in a vedāntic sense by the Brahmins. (Indian Theism. MacNicol. P.76)

The Gītā has elements in it perhaps to justify all these views. It is a great synthesis of the Vedas, of the Upanisads, of the Bhāgavata religion, of the epic, of the Vedānta, the Sāṃkhya, and the Yoga systems of philosophy, of Buddhism, of polytheism, pantheism, monism, theism, transcendentalism, immanence and what not. It is broadly catholic and not critical, and hence everybody can justify his own position with regard to it. However, I am inclined to take the view of Garbe with a few modifications which will be clear as we discuss the process and the various elements of the book.

The element of the Bhāgavata religion in the Gītā.

The original Gītā, as we saw before, was most probably a purely theistic poem. The germ of it, at least, must have come from the Bhāgavata religion which prevailed in the North-western part of India. The Bhāgavatas were a theistic people that worshipped Vāsudeva. Later on Vāsudeva was identified with Kṛṣṇa, and both of them were identified with Viṣṇu. There are those who hold that the teachings of the Bhāgavata religion and that of the Gītā are identical. Whether they are identical or not, we shall not be very far from right in holding that the strong note of the theistic element in the Gītā came mainly from the Vāsudeva cult of the Bhāgavatas. In all probability, the original Gītā was the work of some Bhāgavata saint, and used as the text-book of the Bhāgavatas as Garbe suggests. Later on it was revised and adapted to meet the need of a wider circle. In this revision and adaptation we find the taking in of at least three more elements. The first of these is the epic Mahābhārata.

The Epic Element.

The revisor did not like the simple mould into which the original poem was cast. He wanted to put the great truth in some dramatic form. Therefore, he connects it with the epic, and places it on the battlefield. The personal saviour is identified with the Kṛṣṇa of the Mahābhārata, already a deified hero. He imparts the great spiritual truth to Arjuna. He begins his instruction about dharma in a particular instance, and then it is universalised. The opening scene is on the battlefield, but during the course of the development of the book, the din of war is hushed. We hear only very dimly occasional sounds from the battlefield. The conversation has gone deeper and is centered round the inner reality of the Ātman. There, in that solitude, the Divine Being speaks in ^a still small voice to the human soul. He hears, understands and sees great vision of truth and reality. But unfortunately for us, it goes back to the same field of battle. 18: 73. Whether the purpose of the book is served better by this connection and dramatic setting is a question on which opinions are divided, and about which we shall not say anything here.

However, the Gītā as it stands today forms a part of the Bhīṣmaparva of the Mahābhārata, and like the epic, the revisor tries to elaborate the principle of dharma whenever he has an opportunity. But it is neither in the matter of dharma nor in the dramatic setting, but in the fact of the hero of the book that the Mahābhārata has really entered into the Gītā. Whatever other elements might have entered into the making of the personality of Kṛṣṇa, what the epic supplied stands clear.

Kṛṣṇa rightly belongs to the epic. It is a very doubtful question whether the first stratum of the Mahābhārata contained

any mention of Kṛṣṇa or even of the Pāndavas. There it is a narration of a war between the Kauravas and the Panchalas. The Pāndavas are supposed to have been a non-Aryan people who did not find their place in the first form of the epic.

In the second form of the poem there is some evidence of the presence of the Pāndavas and of Kṛṣṇa. But even here Kṛṣṇa is neither a great hero nor a demi-god. He is viewed like any other warrior, an opponent of Kamsa.

It is in the third and the fourth forms of the epic that we have the mention of the Pāndavas and of Kṛṣṇa in its fully developed form, Kṛṣṇa as the incarnation of God and the Pāndavas as his friends and devotees, the former helping the latter to put an end to the evil reign of their cousins and establish righteousness.

It is this Kṛṣṇa that speaks in the second form of the Gītā, though there are . . . many other elements that have gone to make up his personality which we shall see in chapter 3.

As to the place of the Gītā in the Mahābhārata and its scene on the Kurukṣetra, there are various opinions. On the one hand there are those who hold (Rādhakrishnan) that it is a grave crisis ~~such~~ as the battlefield that stimulates the ultimate values in thinking minds, and it is the most fitting place where some of the highest spiritual truths may be imparted. On the other hand there are those who contend (Tattvabudhūn) that the Gītā is an interpolation awkwardly introduced into the original poem.

With regard to the first position we can fully grant that we sometimes realise the eternal verities and reality of life at some great crisis as at no other time. But it is unnatural to suppose that the chief persons of a great battle would ~~not~~

a long conversation of the kind we have in the Gītā on the day of battle when both armies are drawn in battle array and the action about to begin. But, however much we may think it unnatural or dislike the idea of this highly prized devotional book to be associated with the horrors of war, the revisor found it fitting to adopt for his own purpose two of the most outstanding figures of the epic and the action of war to illustrate some of the great teachings with regard to morality and spirituality.

The Vedas in the Gītā.

Vedic elements were not altogether absent in the original Gītā. They are bound to enter into any form of Indian devotional literature. But the Vedic Kṛṣṇa probably had no place in the making of the personality of Vāsudeva. This was supplied by the revisor when he identified Kṛṣṇa with Vāsudeva. Kṛṣṇa was not a mere deified hero of the Mahābhārata. He had a Vedic origin and an age-long history or rather legend behind him. (See Chapter 3.) It is difficult to ascertain what other ^{Vedic} elements were supplied by the revisor, and what elements there were in the original Gītā. However, it is natural to suppose from the nature of the injunctions given in the Gītā about the Vedas that most of them came from the hands of the revisor who took a definite critical, yet very sympathetic attitude towards them. He does not give the supreme place to the Vedic rites. They are intended for people of a certain lower cultural status. For others they stand in the way of supreme perfection. True freedom does not come through the performance of the Vedic rites. It comes from the knowledge of the Bhagavān. When we know this secret of salvation, there is no more need of Vedic sacrifices. 2:42-45; 9:20-21. Yet he does not ignore the Vedas nor their authority completely. He alludes ^{to the idea} that

to attain perfection one ought to obey also the ordinances of the Vedas¹. He enjoins sacrifices; but they are to be done without attachment and the thought of a reward. 17:12.

The Upanisadic Elements in the Gītā.

There can be no doubt that the revisor, whoever he may have been, was well-versed in the philosophy of the Upanisads. While the Gītā's spiritual elements are allowed to stand, he clothes them in monistic philosophy. There is an attempt at a fusion of theism and monism in the Gītā. But in the nature of things such a fusion could not be effected. It is difficult to say whether this attempt of the revisor is an asset or a draw-back to the book. On the one hand, we might say, that the original spiritual purpose of the poem is a little obscured by the introduction of an uncalled for philosophy, and the philosophy itself is made inconsistent. But on the other, we might hold, that what we find in the second edition is the full assertion of the strong theistic tendency that was all along present in the Upanisads. The revisor did not or could not detach the spiritual from the philosophical from then, for religion and philosophy almost always went hand in hand in Hindoo thinking. Hence he carried both over into the Gītā. Thus the theistic tendency of the Vedas and of the Upanisads found its full expression in the second edition of the Gītā, though it also adopted the pantheistic and monistic view of reality and made allowance even for polytheistic conceptions. The Gītā's philosophy centers around the monism of the Upanisadic thinkers, while its religion is a combination of the theistic faith of the Bhāgavatas and also that of the Vedas and of the Upanisads.

It is very likely that even the dramatic setting in which

¹ Therefore let-Scriptures be thy authority, in determining what ought to be done, or what ought not to be done. Knowing what hath been declared by the ordinances of the Scriptures, how ought to work in this world. 6²⁴

the Gītā is placed is suggested by the Upaniṣads. A passage in the Kathāpaniṣad runs thus, "Know the Self to be the charioteer, and the body to be the chariot, the understanding to be the driver and the sensorium to be the rein.... The man whose driver is wisdom and whose rein consists of sensorium reaches the end of the path --the highest place of the all-pervading....There is nothing superior to the Person; He is the end, the highest Goal" Kathāpaniṣad 3:22. The latter part of this passage is almost literally reproduced at the end of the third chapter of the Gītā.

There are also several verses in the Gītā that are directly borrowed from the Upaniṣads. For example B. G. 2:9 is taken from Katha 2:19. It runs thus:

If the slayer think to slay,
If the slain think himself slain,
Both these understand not.
This One slays not, nor is slain.

B.G.3:42

It is said that the senses
are great
Greater than the senses is
the manas,
Greater than the manas is
Buddhi,
Greater than the Buddhi is
He(The Supreme)

Katha.3:10.

Higher than the sense are the
objects of sense
Higher than the objects of sense
is the mind(Manas)
Higher than the mind is the
intellect(Buddhi)
Higher than the intellect is
the Great Self(Atman)

The same idea is found in the following.

B.G.6:11-12.

In a pure place, established
on a fixed seat of his own.
neither very much raised nor
very low, made of a cloth, a
black antelope skin, and
kusha grass, one over the
other...he should practice
yoga for the purification
of the self.

Svet. 2:10

In a clean level spot, free from
pebbles, fire and gravel,
By the sound of water and other
propinquities,
Favourable to thought, not offensive
to the eye,
In a hidden retreat protected from
the wind, one should practice
yoga.

Compare also, B.G.2:29 to Kat.2:7; B.G.8:11 to Kat.2:15;

B.G.6:13. to Svet. 2:8.

The discussion of *ksara* (perishable), and *aksara* (i.perishable) *Ksetra* (field), and *ksetrajña* (know.r of the field) are based on the *Upaniṣads*. *Bhakti* as we shall see in chapter 5 is a development of *upāsana*. The idea of freedom, deliverence, love and devotion for the Supreme, the conception of the Ultimate Reality, disinterested action and non-attachment, all of these are taken fully or partly from the *Upaniṣads* or are developed from them.

Considering all these different factors of the *Upaniṣads* in the *Gītā*, we need not hesitate to give the *Gītā* its full name -- *Bhagavadgītāpaniṣad*. The traditional account gives the relation between the *Gītā* and the *Upaniṣads* thus: "The *Upaniṣads* are the cows, *Kṛṣṇa* is the milker, Arjuna the calf, and the nectar-like *Gītā* is the excellent milk". "The *Gītā*," says Farquhar, "was written to become the layman's *Upaniṣad*. It may be also be said with truth that the *Gītā* is a worthy successor of the old *Upaniṣads*."

The *Gītā* might have continued ^{its} life in this revised form till the beginning or the middle of the Christian era. It was not perhaps universally accepted till that time.

It was about this period that Buddhism began to threaten even the foundations of the Brahmanic faith. Brahmanism had to devise some means by which to save itself. Buddhism was a growing factor and Brahmanism was losing hold of its adherents. Buddhists, whether theists or atheists made Buddha the central figure. He was *Devātideva*, and the Buddhists represented him as one to whom even the gods of Brahmanism were paying homage. Buddha was unborn, pre-existent, the supreme deity. If Brahmanism were to withstand the growing popularity of Buddha and of Buddhism and save itself, it also had to rally its forces under a central

figure and a common faith. "Adapt or perish" is as true in the religious field as in any other. Brahmanism found the *Gītā* best adapted to her needs. There were already thousands and perhaps millions who looked upon *Kṛṣṇa* as the incarnate saviour, and the *Gītā* as the words of *Kṛṣṇa* that teach the way of salvation. Therefore she decided to adopt this central figure and the book embodying his words for her purpose. But it was impossible to adopt the *Gītā* without further revision, if it were to serve the purpose that Brahmanism had in mind. The book did not include everything that she wanted to include. Therefore, an editor, most probably a Brahman more inclined to be catholic and liberal and less inclined to be spiritual, brought into it all the elements that he could possibly bring in. Spiritual conviction gives place to the spirit of compromise. The *Gītā* is made to shake hands with every body, even with a *Śāṃkhya* atheist! But first of all he takes from the rival himself very many things that were good and attractive and includes them in the *Gītā*. Thus in the final revision of the book we have first,

The Buddhistic Element

Buddhism is not mentioned in the *Gītā*, but its influence is seen especially in the *Gītā*'s ethical ideals. We already noted that the principle of *ahimsā* in the *Gītā* is most probably a reflex of Asoka. The idea of action without attachment might also be borrowed from Buddhism, though it was not altogether absent in early Hindooism. The *Gītā* almost reproduces what Buddhism says.

Vasetthasutta.43.

B. G. 2:57

Whosoever, after leaving human attachment(yoga) has overcome divine attachment, and is liberated from all attachment, him I call a Brahman.

He who on every side is without attachments, whatever hap of fair and foul, who neither likes nor dislikes, of such a one the understanding is well poised.

Jārāsutta.9.

As a drop of water does not stick to a lotus...so a muni does not cling to anything, namely to what is seen or heard or thought.

Both similes taken from a pond (where lotus and tortoise are found together.)

Dhammapada.367.

He who does not grieve over what is no more, he indeed is called a Bhikṣu.

Again they agree in their description of the ideal man.

Dhammapada. 362.

He who controls his hand, he who controls his feet, he who controls his speech, he who is well controlled, he who delights inwardly, who is collected, who is solitary and content, him they call Bhikṣu.

or, Vasetthasutta.49

The man that after leaving pleasure and disgust, is calm and free from the elements of existence, who is a hero, and has conquered all the world, him I call a Brahman.

Dhammapada.418.

Him I call indeed a Brahman who has left what gives pleasure and what gives pain, who is cold, and free from all germs (of renewed life), the hero who has conquered all the worlds.

B.G. 2:58.

Then, again, as a tortoise draws in on all sides its limbs, he withdraws his senses from the objects of sense, then is his understanding well-poised.

B.G. 5:10 The simile of the lotus also is found.

B.G. 2:11.

The wise grieve neither for the living nor for the dead.

B.G. 4:21-22

Hoping for naught, his mind and self controlled, having abandoned all greed, performing action by the body alone..content with whatsoever he obtaineth without effort, free from the pairs of opposites, without envy, balanced in success and failure, though acting he is not bound.

B.G. 2:56

He whose mind is free from anxiety amid pains, indifferent amid pleasures, loosed from passion, fear and anger, is called a sage of stable mind.

Agreement is also seen in the matter of ^vdeption and way of attaining the goal. The word Nirvāna occurs in the Gītā, 3:15 But neither the word nor the idea is peculiar to Buddhism, though there is a probability that the Gītā adopted it from Buddhism.

Dhammapada. 364,381.

He who dwells in the law, delights in the law, meditates on the law, follows the law, that Bhikṣu will never fall away from the true law.

The Bhikṣu full of delight, who is calm in the doctrine of Buddha, will reach the quiet place (nirvāna) of cessation of natural desires and happiness.

B.G. 9:29,30; 3:5; 7:14; 9:34.

They verily who worship me they are in me.....Worship me with undivided heart...Thinking upon me only..he entereth into my being. They who come to me, they cross over this illusion

On me fix thy mind, be devoted to me, harmonised thus in the Self thou shall come unto me, having me as thy supreme goal.

The general resemblance of the ethics of the Gītā and of Buddhism may be seen especially by a comparison of B.G. 2:55-72 4:16-23; 5:18-23; Chapters 16 and 18 and ^{the} Dhammapāda ~~as a whole~~.

Like Buddhism the Gītā protests against the absolute authority of the Vedas. But it is not a thorough-going protest. Obedience to the ordinances of the Vedas ~~are~~ ^{is} also enjoined. Thus, it shows itself to be more conservative. Like Buddhism, there is also an attempt to relax the rigours of caste, and salvation is provided even to women and to Sūdras. ^{The} Gītā accepts the golden mean of Buddhism and discourages asceticism. Thus, though the Gītā makes reformation on the lines of Buddhism, on the whole it holds a more conservative position, and keeps its continuity with the past, and hence it had a much greater success than Buddhism in India.

The Vedāntic Monism in the Gītā.

The term Vedānta appears only once in the Gītā, 15:5 and there it is used in the sense of Upaniṣad. But the philosophy of the Vedānta school appears throughout.

According to the Vedānta system, the Supreme Reality is one and it is spiritual. He(It) is nirguṇa(qualityless), but he is the source of all things. He has no purpose in view and is actionless. The activity of this world is due to its māyā or līlā. He is

beyond the range of thought or speech. The cause of the material world is Brahman associated with māyā. Its substance is Brahman, but its form is māyā. The Brahman on the lower plane becomes God. The two fundamental postulates are, 1. The Ātman is, 2. The Brahman is the one Supreme Reality. They are identical. The Absolute is to be defined as that which has no part or form. My Ātman cannot be a part of the Brahman, because the latter has no parts. There is nothing outside of Brahman, and hence the Ātman is equal to Brahman.

That the final editor of the Gītā included ^o great many of these doctrines is evident, so much so that some (Garbe) are led to think that the Gītā is a text book of the Bhāgavatas revised in the Vedāntic sense.

Kṛṣṇa is the Brahman, 7:29; 8:3-4; 10:12. He is the Ātman, 10:20; 4:6. The loftiest Self, First Cause, Brahmā himself is less great than He, Infinite, God of Gods, home of all worlds, Unperishing, Sat, Asat, That Supreme, First of the Gods, most ancient Man, supreme receptacle of all that lives, knower and known, the dwelling place on high; in his vast form the universe is spread. 11:37-38. He is also Puruṣottama, 8:1; 10:15; 11:3; 15:1; the unborn, 4:6; 7:25; 10:3.12; the eternal, the supreme abode, 10:12; without beginning, 10:3; without end, 11:37; imperishable, 11:13.37; unknowable, 7:26; 10:2,14, omniscient, 7:26, omnipotent, 7:7; 10:40; the Father of this universe, Mother, Ordainer, Grandsire, 9:17, the Way, the Supporter, the Lord, the Witness, the Dwelling place, the Refuge, the Friend, the Origin, the Dissolution, the undecaying Seed, 9:18, the source of the universe, 7:6, He causes all things to revolve by means of his māyā, 13:61. While Kṛṣṇa is the supreme power of the universe, 9:10,17-18, he is altogether without personal

interest in the activity therein displayed, 4:14, he sits un-concerned, 9:9, controlling his own nature, 9:8, hence actionless and not bound by the results of action, 4:14, 9:9. By him all this world is pervaded in his unmanifested aspect; all things have root in him, but he is not rooted in them, 9:4. Though birthless and unchanging of essence and though lord of born beings, yet in his sway over nature that is his own, he comes to birth by his own maya.

Thus the new Gita by its spirit of compromise puts an end to the long continued struggle between the worshippers of Viṣṇu, and the Vedāntic school. There were, even among the Vedāntists, a few who held that the Brahman was personal. The Gītā joined forces not only with them, but with the extreme monists as well. Theism and monism are thus combined in the book. But the Gītā does not stop there. It includes also

The Sāṃkhya and the Yoga Elements.

The main doctrine of the Sāṃkhya is opposed to the Vedāntic monism, and is certainly opposed to theism. It is realistic as opposed to idealism, dualistic as opposed to the One Reality. Kapila, its founder, denies the doctrine of Brahman, the one All-Soul, though he grants the existence of individual souls. The Sāṃkhya dualism is expressed in two words prakṛti (primary matter) and puruṣa (individual soul). Soul and matter are absolutely different. Matter is eternal and indestructible. It consists of sattva, rajas, and tanas (goodness, passion, and darkness). They were in complete equilibrium in prakṛti. Creation was on account of a disturbance of this equilibrium. All changes happen in matter. Soul is completely passive; but it exercises an influence upon matter as a magnet on a piece of iron. If souls

were abstracted from this universe, we would be all here, but nobody would be conscious of it. To get rid of pain is to think that I am not I. Our failure is the failure of avivēka (non-discrimination) between soul and matter. Liberation is the result of discrimination between prakṛti and purusa.

The scheme of thought in the Yoga is the Sāṃkhya. ^{Same as in the} The Yoga is a theistic and practical development of the latter. In all their main doctrines they agree, except for the fact that the Yoga recognises the existence of God. Purusa is the perfect Soul. It also gives practical rules for attaining peace of mind.

The Sāṃkhya and the Yoga are often mentioned by name in the Gītā. But they are not always spoken of as two classical schools of thought, but as reflective and meditative methods of reaching the Supreme. In the opinion of the Gītā, both the Sāṃkhya and the Yoga are one. 5:4-5; 2:39; 3:3; 13:24. They form the bases of all action and morality.

The Gītā takes from the Sāṃkhya its psychology and the order of creation, though it is not clear whether it accepts their metaphysical implications. 2:11-16; 18-20; 27-29; 5:14; 7:4. The existence of God is denied or avoided by the Sāṃkhya. But the Gītā has to affirm it. Purusa is only a form of God. The Sāṃkhya distinction between purusa and prakṛti is recognised. Both of them are eternal. "Know thou that Matter and Spirit are both without beginning; know thou also that modifications and qualities are all Matter-born." 13:20. "He who thus knoweth Spirit and matter with its qualities in whatsoever condition he may be, he shall not be born again." 13:24. This, no doubt, is the pure Sāṃkhya way of liberation. The character of the Purusa and its relation to Prakṛti in the Gītā is also pure Sāṃkhya. Purusa is the spectator, and Prakṛti

is the actor. He is wrong who thinks 'I act'. The theory of the three gunas seen in chapter 14 and the psychological account of the internal organs and the senses are also from the Sāṅkhyā system. The Sāṅkhyā terms buddhi, ahaṅkāra, sānas etc are constantly used by the Gītā.

The Gītā gives great prominence to the Yoga throughout. Its practices are accepted. Ahyāsa(practice) and vairāgya(indifference to worldly objects) are enjoined to bring the mind and the body under control."Let the yogi constantly engage himself in yoga, remaining in secret places by himself, with thought and self subdued, free from hope and greed" 6:10. Bhaktiyoga, jñāna yoga and karma yoga are the main topics ~~—~~ of the Gītā.

The Yoga has not got anything so fundamentally different from the original spirit of the Gītā as the Sāṅkhyā. The new form of the Gītā tries to make a reconciliation not only with the Yoga but also with the Sāṅkhyā as well. It repeats the creed of the atheist with him,"Know thou that matter and Spirit are both without beginning; know thou also that modifications and qualities are all Matter-born."13:20. The Gītā has room not only for the theist, ^{the} polytheist, the pantheist, and the monist, but also for the atheist. A fusion of all is attempted by the final editor. ~~But~~ In the nature of things such a fusion could not be effected. But this accounts for the popularity of the Gītā. Salvation is provided for everybody, even for an atheist. One wonders whether this is not the real weakness of the Gītā. Any religion that adulterates itself or tones itself down in order to gain adherents does lose its real strength and vitality. Yet, in spite of this weakness the original purpose and message of the Gītā shines through.

Is there any Christian influence on the Gītā?

We might close this chapter with a brief consideration whether the Gītā has any Christian influence or elements in it. This is very doubtful, though there are a few (E.G. Sadhu Sunder Singh and E. W. Hopkins, "India Old and New") who hold that the Gītā as a late production might have been influenced by the Christian scriptures especially the Fourth Gospel.

The parallels between the Gītā and the Fourth Gospel are very striking as we shall see later. But there is no other ground to suppose that the writer of the Gītā ever knew of the Fourth Gospel. It is in its original and second forms that the Gītā bears most resemblance to the Fourth Gospel. We placed both of them somewhere before the Christian era. The Gītā is further removed from the Fourth Gospel in its final additions from the Vedānta and the Sāṃkhya-Yoga. Therefore it is unlikely that Christianity and much less the Fourth Gospel had anything to do with the formation of the ideas of the Gītā. Both the Gītā and the Fourth Gospel are ^{works of} 'like passions' who met the same kind of problems and offered the same kind of solutions to the world, though there are a few fundamental differences between those solutions.

Before we go into the problems or their solutions we shall analyze the two books as to bring out their general contents.

Chapter 2.

The Analyses of the Bhagavad Gītā and the Fourth Gospel.

1. The Analysis of the Bhagavad Gītā.

The general plan of a book is laid according to its purpose. In the case of the Gītā, though the purpose is clear, the later hands that worked at it to suit their notions have more or less spoiled its plan so that we cannot make a clear analysis of the book. The same ideas are repeated over and over, sometimes almost in the same words. Contradictory ideas are seen side by side. The Gītā does not try to reconcile them and make a consistent system. Theism, polytheism, pantheism, monism, Vedānta, Sāṃkhya-Yoga are often seen almost in the same page, if not in the same verse. No regular progressive thought can be easily detected. This makes the analysis of the book difficult. Therefore, all that we can do is to take the book chapter by chapter, and to try to unfold their contents.

The general contents of the book can be divided into three parts of six books each.

1. Books 1-6. Karma Mārga or the Way of Works.
2. Books 7-12. Bhakti Mārga or the Way of Loving Devotion.
3. Books. 13-18. Jñāna Mārga or the Way of Intuitive Knowledge.

Mr. C. Johnston puts the three divisions as Aspiration, ^{suggests that} Illumination, and Realisation. Dr. Saunders calls the first part ^{deals with} "The nature and duties of man", the second "The nature of the Supreme Being", and the third "The identity of the individual and the Universal Self".

None of the above-given divisions are exact. The nature of the book is such that no clear-cut division can be given. Any kind of

division is apt to overlap one another. By whatever name we may call them, all the three elements are seen throughout the book with varying emphasis.

Section 1. Books 1-6. Karma Marga or The Way of Works.

Book 1. . . . On the field of battle Arjuna, the chief fighter Introductory. is overcome by perplexity and despondency, and he (Prologue) refuses to fight. He tells Krsna that it is a The Despondency sin to kill relatives. "I do not wish to kill of Arjuna. though myself slain." 35.

Book 2. Krsna ridicules Arjuna and tells him not to be weak-kneed, but shaking off his faint-heartedness to stand up and do the duty of a ksattriya-- to fight.

Arjuna is much more perplexed. His mind is confused as to dharma. 7. He says it is better to eat even the beggar's crust than to slay his noble gurus. 5. Arjuna says he will not fight.

Thereupon Krsna speaks. "Arjuna, your words sound like wisdom, but they are not. The wise grieve neither for the living nor for the dead. 11. For there is only one reality and that is the Ātman. That is immortal, 12. indestructible and eternal, 16, 17, 18. The unreal hath no being. 16. He(Ātman) slayeth not nor is slain, 19-20.

Having defined the nature of the Ātman up to 30 Krsna comes back to the point of Arjunas duty of fighting a righteous war, 31-34.

After explaining his teaching according to the Sāmkhya, Krsna teaches duty according the Yoga. Arjuna's business is with action and never with its fruits, 47. Perform action dwelling in union with the divine and renouncing attachment. 48. The place of the Vedas is also discussed, 42-46.

55-72 speaks mainly of controlling the manas and the senses in order to do action without attachment. Action without attachment leads to salvation; but it is inferior to the yoga of discrimination and the knowledge which comes out of the union with the divine.

Book 3. Arjuna's confusion of mind still continues. He says The Yoga of "If knowledge is superior to action why doest thou Action. enjoin on me this terrible action...Tell me with certainty the one way by which I may reach bliss. 1,2.

Thereupon Krsna enters into a discourse which reconciles the Sāmkhya and the Yoga philosophy. He explains the yoga of action. He tells not only why a man should do his duty, but also how he should do it.

The discourse ends with a Buddhist note that desire is the real enemy, and to kill this enemy restraining the self by the Self. 45.

Book 4.
The Yoga
of Jnana.

Kṛṣṇa reveals to Arjuna who he really is and what the source of his authority. "Though unborn the imperishable self and also the Lord of beingsI am born through my own power... from age to age for the protection of the good and the destruction of the evil-doers. 6-8.

He who knoweth Kṛṣṇa escapes rebirth and goes to him. 9. 10-15 Kṛṣṇa speaks about the jñāna of the Lord. 16-33 speaks of the jñāna about action. "All actions in their entirety culminate in jñāna. 33. 33-42 elaborates on the yoga of jñāna. Even the most sinful cross over their sin by the raft of jñāna. Therefore with the sword of jñāna cuts the ignorance-born doubt. 42.

Book 5.
The Yoga of
the Renun-
ciation of
Action

Arjuna cannot understand why Kṛṣṇa praises both yoga and also renunciation of action. So he asks Kṛṣṇa to tell him conclusively which is better. 1.

Kṛṣṇa says that both renunciation and yoga of action lead to the highest bliss ; but of the two yoga of action is certainly better than renunciation of action. 2.

Kṛṣṇa also gives an interpretation of the Yoga and the Sāṃkhya philosophy. They are at bottom one. The Sāṃkhya is the way of the intellect and the Yoga the way of the will. He who is duly established in one obtains the fruit of both. 4. Kṛṣṇa recognises the diversity of human nature. Salvation may be obtained in more ways than one.

No action can be right without renunciation and without action renunciation is hard to attain. 6. He who acts placing all actions in the Eternal is unaffected by sin as a lotus leaf by the water. 10.

Verses 11-29 elaborate mainly the Yoga of renunciation.

Book 6.
The Yoga of
Self-Restraint.

The first few verses are almost a reiteration of the thoughts of chapter 5.

Then Kṛṣṇa speaks of the yoga of self-restraint. Action may cease when one obtains absolute detachment from action.

Further, the higher self of the self-controlled is peaceful and uniform in cold and heat. The Ātman is the friend of the self in whom the self by the Ātman is vanquished; but to the unsubdued self the Ātman becomes the enemy. 5-10.

10-32 gives rules for the practice of the yoga. When a man practices yoga he sees the Self in all beings and all beings in the Self. Sees Kṛṣṇa in everything and everything in Kṛṣṇa. 29-30.

33-36. Arjuna says that his mind is so difficult to subdue. Kṛṣṇa answers that it can be subdued by constant practice and properly directed energy.

37-39. Arjuna asks as to what happens to a man that fails to subdue the self and attain perfection

in the yoga and yet possesses faith.

40-45. Kṛṣṇa answers that one who works righteousness never treads the path of woe. He is reborn in a pure and blessed house or into the family of the wise yogins, and he again labours for perfection and then fully perfected he reaches the Supreme Goal.

46-47. The yogi is greater than the man of action and even the wise man. Therefore be a yogi with the inner self abiding in me.

Thus the first section ends with a note that contemplation is superior to action as well as knowledge.

Section 2. Books 7-12. Bhakti Mārga or The Way of Loving Devotion.

In the second section, the personality of Kṛṣṇa becomes more important. In the first section we got a glimpse of the fact that Kṛṣṇa is not only a charioteer, but an incarnation of God born from age to age to establish the law of righteousness. This is fully brought out in this section. He does not only teach the truth about the Ultimate Reality, but he himself is the Ultimate Reality. Hence devotion to him is demanded.

Book 7.
The Yoga of
Discernment
or Discrimi-
native
Knowledge.

Four important points are seen in this book.

1. The true nature of Kṛṣṇa. "Vāsudeva is all". 19. He is the Eternal Seed of all beings, Reason of reason, the Word of power etc. Nothing higher than Kṛṣṇa. All things are threaded on him as rows of pearls on a string. 4-13; 26.
2. It is the knowledge of Kṛṣṇa, coming to him and worshipping him that brings salvation. The wise do it, and Kṛṣṇa is supremely dear to the wise. 1-3; 14; 16-19; 28-30.
3. The evil-doing, the deluded, the vilest men do not reach Kṛṣṇa. 15; 25; 27.
4. The worshippers of the shining ones go to the shining ones. But they do not reach Kṛṣṇa, the Supreme Goal, because they are devoid of real understanding. They consider the unmanifest as manifest. 20-24.

Book 8.
The Yoga of
the Supreme
Being.

Arjuna asks what is Eternal, what self-knowledge, what action. 1, 2.

Kṛṣṇa answers:

1.
 - a. The indestructible, the Supreme is the Eternal. He is the Ancient, the Omniscient, the All-ruler, of form unimaginable. 9.
 - b. His essential nature is called self-knowledge.
 - c. The emanation that causes the birth of beings is action. 3.4.
2. Who enters this Eternal? It is the man of

devotion, who constantly thinks of Kṛṣṇa only, with mind and reason set on him, meditating with fixed devotion that enters into the the Eternal Supreme Abode. Having gone thither he returns not. Devotion is the key that opens the door to the Eternal. 5-28.

Book 9.
The Yoga of
Kingly
Knowledge
and Kingly
Mystery.

Full devotion is the central theme of this book. While only the rich could buy off the gods by sacrifices and only the cultured could pursue the way of knowledge, Bhakti or loving devotion is in the reach of all. "He who offereth with devotion a leaf, a flower, a fruit, water, that I accept from the striving self, offered as it is with devotion. 6.

1. 4-10 } Elaborates further, the nature of the
15-19 } Supreme Being. I, the Father, Mother,
Supporter, Grandsire, Holy One, Word
of Power etc. 17,18.
2. 11-12. It is the foolish people that disregard
this Supreme Being.
3. 13-14 } Set forth the glory of the devotion to
20-22 } Kṛṣṇa. "They verily who worship me
26-34. } with devotion, they are in me and I
also in them. 29. Even if the most
sinful worship me with undivided heart
he too must be accounted righteous. 30.
Even the Sudras tread the highest path
by devotion.
4. 23-25, The worshippers of other objects go to
those objects. But even the devotees of
the shining ones who worship full of
faith, they also worship me. 23.

Book 10.
The Yoga of
Sovereignty.

1. 1-11. He who knows Kṛṣṇa as the Supreme Being,
is liberated from all sin.
2. 12-18. Arjuna's confession that Kṛṣṇa is all in
all. The former asks the latter to tell
him his divine glories by which he
pervades the worlds, and how by constant
meditation he could be known.
3. 19-42. Thereupon Kṛṣṇa tells him his chief
characteristics. Kṛṣṇa is the source
of all, is seated in the hearts of all,
is the seed and essence of all. Whatever is
glorious, good, beautiful and mighty is
his fragment. He remains having per-
vaded this whole universe, with a
fragment of himself.
(God transcends the world, but he remains
within it and supports it. Universe is
a part of God.)

Book 11.
The Yoga of
the Revel-
ation of the
One and the
Many.

1. 1-4. Arjuna is not altogether satisfied by
hearing the divine attributes. Therefore
he asks Kṛṣṇa whether he will be per-
mitted to see his omnipotent form.

2. 5-14. Thereupon a transfiguration takes place and Kṛṣṇa shows himself in his truly divine form, He gives Arjuna divine eyes to behold that form. "Pāṇḍava beheld the whole universe, divided into manifold parts, standing in One, in the body of the Deity of Deities"
3. 15-31, Arjuna on beholding this form overwhelmed by astonishment bows his head and says "Within thy form, O God, the Gods I see, all grades of beings with distinctive marks.... my innermost self is quaking....Have mercy, God supreme...."
4. 32-34. Kṛṣṇa says, "Time am I, manifest on earth to slay mankind..... be thou the outward cause.... destroy them fearlessly, Fight! Thou shalt crush thy rivals.
5. 35-46. Arjuna is still filled with fear and with down-cast face asks for the forgiveness of his sins.
6. 47-51. Kṛṣṇa assumes his familiar shape and consoles Arjuna, asks him to cast away fear and to rejoice. Arjuna does so.
7. 52-55. Kṛṣṇa says, "By devotion to me alone, I may be perceived Arjuna, and known and seen in essence". It is only the devotee that goes to Kṛṣṇa.

Book 12.
The Yoga of
Bhakti or
Loving
Faith.

1. Verse 1. Arjuna asks, 'Who is more learned in the yoga, whether those who worship thee or those who worship the unmanifested?'
2. 2-5. Kṛṣṇa answers, "They who worship me are best in yoga; but they who pay full devotion to the unmanifested they also come to me. Their difficulty is greater because the unmanifested is hard for men to reach. (Here we have the secret of the cry for an incarnation of God.)
3. 6-9. "Therefore worship me with whole-hearted yoga and thou shalt reach me."
4. 10-12. Gives us the comparative merits of different yogas. Wisdom is better than constant practice. Meditation is better than wisdom. Renunciation of the fruit of action is better than meditation. On renunciation follows peace.
5. 13-20. Gives us a summary of the ethical ideal of the Gītā. The devotees that follow this ideal are surpassingly dear to Kṛṣṇa. 20.

Thus ends the second section of the book with an emphasis on absolute devotion, which is the central theme of the Gita.

Section 3. Books 13-18. Jñāna Marga or The way of
Intuitive Knowledge.

This section mainly sets forth the intellectual basis of salvation, the way to reach the Supreme by means of jñāna. Sāṅkhyā philosophy figures very prominently. Consequently many contradictions appear.

Book 13.

The Yoga of
the Distinct-
ion between
the Ksetra
and Ksetrajna
or the Field
and the Know-
er of the
Field

Arjuna asks to be enlightened on prakṛti and puruṣa, kṣetra and kṣetrajña.¹ Kṛṣṇa answers, and it is almost pure Sāṅkhyā philosophy. The body is kṣetra. That which knoweth (the self) is the kṣetrajña. "Understand me as the Knower of the Field in all fields."^{2,3} (Kṛṣṇa tries to combine Sāṅkhyā dualism and Vedāntic idealism.) Wisdom is to know the field and the knower of the field. The rest of the chapter is an attempt to explain the field and the knower of the field, the nature of prakṛti and puruṣa. He brings in Vedānta and Yoga as well. The beginningless Supreme Eternal called neither being nor non-being is free from qualities, enjoying qualities¹⁵, he devours and generates¹⁷. The devotee thus knowing enters into my being¹⁹. Prakṛti and puruṣa are both without beginning. Modifications and qualities are all prakṛti-born²⁰. Puruṣa seated in prakṛti uses the qualities born of prakṛti,²². He who knows the puruṣa and prakṛti with its qualities shall not be born again,²⁴. Matter performs all actions, and the self is actionless,³⁰. They who know the difference between the field and the knower of the field and the liberation of beings from matter go to the Supreme,³⁵.

Book 14.

The Yoga of
the Three
Gunas or
Qualities.

The chapter deals with the three gunas of the Sāṅkhyā -- sattva, rajas, tama (goodness, passion, and darkness).

The Great Eternal is the womb of all beings and Kṛṣṇa is their generating Father,^{3,4}.

5-19 sets forth the different results that the three gunas produce single or in combinations.

Goodness is luminous and healthy,⁶. Passion is the source of attachment and thirst for life,⁷.

Darkness is born of unwisdom and is the cause of indolence and sloth,⁸. When a man crosses over these three qualities, he is liberated and drinks the nectar of immortality.²⁰.

Arjuna asks for the marks of him who has crossed the gunas,²¹.

22-27. The answer is a reiteration of the contents of book 6:8f. He who serves Kṛṣṇa exclusively by the yoga of devotion crosses beyond the gunas and is fit to become the Eternal,²⁶.

Book 15.
The Yoga of
attaining
the Supreme
Spirit.

The book starts with the famous figure of the tree of life taken from the Kathāpanisad, but modified by the Sāmkhya view. This manifold life is a part of Life. Full life is in Kṛṣṇa. 'I am the root of all... I am seated in the hearts of all'¹⁵. There are two puruṣas in the world, the destructible and the indestructible,¹⁶.

Knowledge of the Supreme Self as the way to salvation is elaborated. "He who undeluded knoweth me thus as the Supreme Spirit... he all knowing worship me with his whole being hath become illuminated and has finished his work, 19-20.

Book 16.
The Yoga of
the Division
between the
Divine and
the Demoniac.

A clear-cut division between the nature of the divine and the demoniac is given. "The divine properties are deemed to be for liberation and the demoniacal for bondage",⁵. Held in bondage by a hundred ties the deluded birth after birth attain not unto Kṛṣṇa,²⁰.

1-5. The divine nature is given
6-22. The demoniacal nature is given.

The last two verses state the place of the vedas. Kṛṣṇa says, "Let scriptures be thy authority in determining what ought to be done and what ought not to be done" 24.

Book 17.
The Yoga of
the Division
of the three-
fold Faith.

Arjuna asks as to what is the condition of those who sacrifice full of faith casting aside the ordinances of the scriptures 1.

Thereupon Kṛṣṇa gives a discussion of faith and works. Faith is given great prominence. A man consists of his faith 3. A man's faith shows his character. Severe austerity unenjoined by the scriptures is condemned 5,6,18,19.

14-17 states what true austerity is.

21-22 False liberality is condemned

20. True liberality is enjoined.

Whatever is done without faith, oblation, gift, austerity or other deed is *asat*. It is nought here or hereafter. When they are done with faith and steadfastness it is *sat*.²⁷

Book 18.
The Yoga of
Liberation
by Renuncia-
tion.

This book is the longest of all. It is mainly a summary of the preceding chapters. According to Arjuna's request the essence of renunciation and of relinquishment is set forth severally. Action, reason, pleasure, etc. are explained according to the three gunas. Duties of Brahman, Kṣattrīya, Vaisya and Sudra are given. Renunciation, action without attachment, devotion to Kṛṣṇa are enjoined once more. He who practices these obtains Kṛṣṇa's grace. Thinking upon him the devotee shall overcome all obstacles by his grace,¹⁻⁵³.

The last words of Kṛṣṇa are, "Flee unto him for shelter with all thy being. By his grace thou *shall* obtain supreme peace..... 62. Act as thou listest. ... most secret of all, beloved art thou of me,....

Merge thy manas in me, be my devotee..... I will liberate thee from all sins 63-66.

Do not give this teaching to anybody except to my devotees. 67-68.

Arjuna says "destroyed is my delusion, I have gained knowledge through thy grace....I will do according to thy word. "73.

(Thus most probably it is a return to the battle-field to do his duty as a Ksattriya, to fight without attachment, to slay with devotion to Kṛṣṇa and with the higher knowledge that he neither slays nor is slain.)

The epilogue 74-78 states the wonder and the joy of the narrator. "Where-ever is Kṛṣṇa, Yoga's Lord, where-ever is Partha the archer, assured are there prosperity, victory and happiness. So I think."78.

Thus ends the whole book, and we are left to wonder a little what the real purpose of the book is. It started with the sound of trumpet and of battle-cry. But during the course of its development it ^{has} soared to great spiritual heights. Arjuna was on the "Transfiguration Mount". He saw the Lord in all the splendour and glory of his divine nature. He learned the ways of attaining spiritual freedom -- Karma, Bhakti, Jñāna. He got the vision of the Supreme Goal. But alas! after all these it is too much for us poor mortals to see Arjuna returning to the battle-field with a grim determination to fight, to slay, and to destroy.

2. The Analysis of the Fourth Gospel.

When we pass from the Gita to the Fourth Gospel we feel that we are in a clearer atmosphere. Neither the purpose nor the plan of the book is spoiled by later hands. The purpose stands out prominent. It is given at the end of the book chapter 20:31 "These are written, that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God; and that believing ye might have life through his name". The plan is laid well according to the purpose. After the prologue which is given in the interest of the philosophical readers, the writer at once goes to the main task of proving that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God. The idea of the Logos is not allowed to reappear. There is no unnecessary dragging in of Greek philosophy. All the words, behaviour, and miracles of Jesus are given in such a way as to make clear the purpose of the writer. Hence the analysis is comparatively easy. We may divide the Gospel into three parts as we did in the case of the ~~case of~~ the Gita.

1. Chapters 1-12. The Christ and the Jews.

2. " 13-17. The Christ and the Disciples.

3. " 18-20. The Passion and Resurrection.

Chapter 21. Appendix.

1. Chapters 1-12. The Christ and the Jews.

A. 1:1-18. The prologue.

1. 1:1-5. The pre-existence of the Logos, his divine nature, his creative activity, his place in the universe as Life and Light.

2. 6-8. The work of the witness to the Logos - Light.

3. 9-13. The general manifestation of the Logos in the world and the reward of those who accepted this general manifestation -- the right of being children of God.

14-18. But this general manifestation was not enough. The world on the whole lay in darkness. Hence the Logos took flesh and dwelt among us. He revealed God, 18.

B. 1:19-4:54. The ministry in Galilee, Judaea, and Samaria.

a. 1:19-2:11. Out side of Jerusalem.

1. 1:19-37. The Baptist's work and his testimony to Jesus.

2. 38-51. The interview with and the testimony of Andrew Philip and Nathaniel.

3. 2:1-11. Jesus 'displaying glory' by his first miracle at Cana.

b. 2:12-3:21. In Jerusalem.

1. 2:12-22. The cleansing of the Temple.

2. 2:23-3:21. Its reaction as well as the reaction of the miracles that he performed on the feast day.

(1). 2:23-25. The attitude of the masses, and Jesus' attitude towards them.

(2). 3:1-21. The impression Nicodemus.

3:1-11. Conversation with Nicodemus.

12-21 { The reflections of the evangelist.

& 31-36 }

The interview ^{and reflection} contains three important points.

1. That which is born of the flesh is flesh; and that which is born of the spirit is spirit. 3:3-6.

2. God so loved the world that that he gave his only begotten son, that whosoever believeth in him... should have everlasting life. 3:16

3. He who believes in the Son has eternal life. 3:36.

(3). 3:22-30. The Baptist's further witness of Christ to his disciples.

c. 4:1-54. In Samaria and in Galilee.

1. 4:1-42. The incident with the woman of Samaria.

(1) God is a spirit, they that worship him must worship him in spirit and in truth. 24.

(2) Revelation that Jesus is the Messiah. 26.

(3) The confession of the Samaritans that this is indeed the Christ, the Saviour of the world.

2. 4:43-54. Reception by the Galilaeans and the healing of the nobleman's son.

C. 5:1- 12:50. The work and words of Jesus in Judaea and Jerusalem and the growth of the opposition from the Jews.

a. 5:1-47. Work and words in Jerusalem.

1. 1-9. Healing of the sick man at Bethesda.

2. 10-13. Opposition from the Jews because he broke the sabbath and because he made himself 'equal with God'

19-47. Discourses about his divinity.

1. The Son works the same works ~~as~~ of the Father, 19.

2. All men should honour the Son as they honour the Father. 23.

3. He that believeth hath already passed from death to life. 24.

4. The Father hath given the Son authority to execute Judgment. 27.

5. The Father bears witness to the Son. 37.

6. Ye will not come to me that ye might have life. 40.

b. 6:1-7:9. Outside of Jerusalem.

1. 6:1-14. The feeding of the five thousand by the sea of Tiberias.

15. Its effect --attempt to make him king.

2. 16-21. Jesus walking on the sea

3. 22-25. The crowd flocking to him.

4. 26-59. Discourse on the bread of life.

1. Labour for the meat that endureth unto everlasting life. 27.

2. This is the work of God that ye believe on him whom he hath sent. 29.

3. I am the bread of life. 35.

4. No one can come to me except the Father draws him. 44.

5. My flesh is meat indeed, and my blood is drink indeed. 55.

5. 6:60-66. The effect of the discourse on the disciples.

Many of the disciples went back and walked no more with him. 66.

6. 67-71. Confession of Peter. Lord to whom else shall we go. Thou hast the words of eternal life. Thou art that Christ, the Son of God. 68-69.

7. 7:1-9. His brethren urging him to go to Jerusalem.

c. 7:10-12:50. In Jerusalem again.

1. 7:10-13. Jesus in Jerusalem in secret.

2. 7:14-8:59. Jesus in Jerusalem openly discourses at the feast and the messianic claim

(1) 7:14-53. The discourse at the feast.

1. If any will do his will, he shall know of the doctrine. 17

2. Judge not according to appearance..... 24.

3. I know him; for I am from him and he hath sent me. 29.

4. If any man thirst let him come unto me and drink. 37.

a. The opinion of the people. 15, 25-27, 31, 40-43.

b. The attempt of the Pharisees to destroy Jesus. 30;32;

35;45-53.

(8:1-11. The woman taken in adultery)

(2) 8:12-59. Discourse continued.

1. I am the light of the world. 12.

2. I am from above; ye are of this world. 23.

3. Ye shall know the truth and the truth shall make you free. 32.

4. Whosoever committeth sin is a servant of sin. 34.

5. Which of you convinceth me of sin. 46.

6. If a man keep my saying he shall never see death. 51.

7. Before Abraham was, I am. 58.

3. 9:1-41. A miracle to show that Jesus was the Light, that he came to make the sightless see and the seeing blind. 39. The healing of the blind man.

4, 10:1-42. Discourse on the Good Shepherd.

1. I am the door of the sheep. 7.

2. I am the good shepherd. 11;14.

3. I lay down my life for the sheep, and I have power to take it again. 17.

4. My sheep hear my voice, 27, and I give eternal life. 28.

5. I and my Father are one. 30.

a. The divided opinion among the Jews, 19-24; 41-42.

b. Another attempt to destroy Jesus, 31-33; 39-40.

- 5. 11:1-46. The raising of Lazarus. A miracle to show that Jesus was Life.
I am the resurrection and the Life.25.
- 6. 47-57. An organised effort of the Jews to kill Jesus.
- 7. 12:1-9. Mary's anointing of her Lord.
- 8. 10-19. The Triumphal Entry into Jerusalem.
- 9. 20-50. The universality of Jesus and the last general discourse.
 - 1. 12:20-22. The visit of the Greeks.
 - 2. 23-36. Jesus foreseeing the end. The hour is come that the Son of Man should be glorified.23.
If I am lifted up from the earth, I will draw all men to me. 32.
 - 3. 37-43. The attitude of the Jews.
 - 4. 44-50. Further discourse on the Light of the world.

Section 2. Chapters 13-17. The Christ and the Inner Circle of the Disciples.

- A. 13:1-38. The Last Supper.
 - 1. 13:1-17. Christ's example of humility and service.
 - 2. 18-30. Judas on his way to betrayal
 - 3. 31-38. A short discourse, and Peter's assurance.
- B. 14:1-16:33. Long discourse to the company of disciples.
- C. 17:1-26. High-priestly prayer.

This section contains, (The following points are taken from Dr. Saunders' analysis of the Fourth Gospel)

- 1. The glory of humility (and of service.) 13:1-30.
- 2. The glory of suffering. 16:2-5;22.
- 3. The glory of love.
As the Father has loved me so have I loved you.15:9.
As I have loved you, you ought to love one another.13:34.
- 4. The unity of the Church. That they may all be one.17:21.
- 5. The life in Christ. 15:1-27.
I am the vine ; ye are the branches.15:5.
I in them and thou in me. 17:23
- 6. The unity of Christ and God.
He who hath seen me hath seen the Father. 14:9
That they may be one as we are one. 17:11.
- 7. The coming of the Holy Spirit.16:1-15.
I will send him to you.16:7. He will lead you into all truth.16:13.
- 8. Peace.
Peace I leave with you. My peace I give unto you. 14:27.

Section 3. Chapters 18-20. Passion and Resurrection.

A. 18:1-19:42. Passion.

1. 18:1-12. Arrest
2. 13-27. Trial before the high-priest and denial of Peter.
3. 28-19:15. Trial before Pilate.
Behold the man, 19:5.
4. 19:16-37. Judgment and crucifixion.
"Jesus of Nazareth, the king of the Jews", 19:19.
It is finished, 19:30.
5. 19:38-42. Burial.

B. 20:1-29. Resurrection.

1. 20:1-10. The empty tomb.
2. 11-29. The appearances.
 - a. 20:11-18. The appearance to Mary.
I ascend unto my Father and to your Father, to my God and to your God. 17.
 - b. 19-23. First appearance to the disciples.
Receive ye the Holy Ghost. 22.
 - c. 24-29. The second appearance to the disciples including Thomas. Blessed are they that have not seen and yet have believed. 29.

C. 20:30-31. The epilogue.

These are written that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God; and believing ye might have life through his name. 31.

Chapter 21:1-25. The Appendix.

- A. 21:1-14. The appearance to the disciples on the sea of Tiberias.
- B. 15-23. The discourse with Simon Peter.
Feed my sheep.
- C. 24-25. The editor's comment.

Thus ends the Gospel. There is nothing uncertain about its message. The purpose and the plan is clear. No doubt the imagination of the writer has played a great part. He has presented a Christ different from what the Synoptic writers have presented. Yet the main incidents of the Gospel are historically true. The evangelist writes from personal conviction and experience. Though not absolutely logical, he tries to prove that Jesus is the ^{and the Son of God.} messiah
 "He who believes on Him has eternal life," is the message that the writer conveys to the readers.

Chapter 3.

The Kṛṣṇa of the Gītā and the Christ of the Fourth Gospel.

In so many respects the Kṛṣṇa of the Gītā bears resemblance to the Christ of the Fourth Gospel that it is worth our while to compare the two persons.

The imagination of the Gospel writer has given colour to the life and work of Jesus. Nevertheless, the real personality of the Christ can be seen through it all. But this is not possible with the Kṛṣṇa of the Gītā. There does not seem to be any clear-cut person behind the name. The ordinary masses associate him with Gopāla-Kṛṣṇa, the cowherd god, and they try to explain away or allegorise some of his immoral deeds. For others he is Vāsudeva-Kṛṣṇa. Still for a few others he is the hero, or demi-god of the Mahabharata. To a few thinking Hindoos, he stands for an ideal ^{to which} ~~that~~ the author of the Gītā has given the name Kṛṣṇa. The author is one who is supposed to have realised God in his fully awakened soul, ^{who} ~~had~~ saw Him in his very self and impersonated himself as Kṛṣṇa, the popular deity of his day. Thus Tattvabhushan says, "In uttering his lofty teachings, he (the author) attempts to transcend the limitations of his finite individuality and speak from the standpoint of the Absolute, the Infinite. That the Kṛṣṇa of the Bhagavad Gītā ignores his finite individuality, and all that belongs to him as a particular person living and moving in a particular time, at a particular place, and under particular circumstances, and speaks from the standpoint of the universal spirit which is in all -- a stand-point which every one possessing the needful enlightenment can occupy --

is evident more or less from every part of the Gita."

(From the Rāja Surya Rāo Lectures. P.105.)

It is difficult to ascertain who exactly Kṛṣṇa is in face of various theories about his person. However, in the Gītā he is an exalted person of great excellence. But there is a long legend or history behind him which the Gītā does not attempt to give.

Before we try to ascertain who Kṛṣṇa is, we must understand another person who is often identified with Kṛṣṇa. In the Gītā 7:19 Kṛṣṇa says, "He who possesses knowledge gives himself up to me, believing Vāsudeva to be all." Again in 10:37 we hear him saying, "Of the Vṛṣnis, Vāsudeva am I." Thus the Kṛṣṇa of the Gītā identifies himself with Vāsudeva. He is often called Vāsudeva-Kṛṣṇa.

~~that~~ At first, Vāsudeva had nothing to do with Kṛṣṇa is evident. According to the stories about him he belonged to the Vṛṣni race B.G.10:37, and was worshipped as a god even from the days of Pāṇini, by a religious sect in the North-western part of India called the Bhāgavatas. Patañjali states that Vāsudeva is one who is pre-eminently worshipful and further says that Pāṇini looked upon him as a divine person. "The eternal God, mysterious, beneficent, and living should be known as Vāsudeva." The worship of Vāsudeva was very old. The sect of the Bhāgavatas was a theistic sect. We noted in another connection the place of the Bhāgavata religion in the formation of the Gītā. But how he came to be identified with Kṛṣṇa ~~will~~ be seen after we discuss the origin and the development of the latter.

We can gather facts about Kṛṣṇa from the epic. There, he is represented sometimes as a non-Aryan hero, sometimes as a Vedic

teacher, and sometimes as a god. In some places he is shown to be worshipping Mahādeva. In other places he himself is a god. There are places where his divinity is denied by some and defended by others. "Whoever says that Kṛṣṇa is a mere man is of dull intellect", says Bhiṣma in Sabhāparva in defence of Sisupāla's contest of Kṛṣṇa's claim to the rank of a deity. We also find passages where he is looked upon as the warrior-Lord of Dvāraka. Sometimes he is represented as a religious preacher of monotheism, God being Bhagavat; at other times he is identified with Bhagavat himself. (An exact parallel to this is to be found in the case of Christ.) Thus in the epic, Kṛṣṇa occupies various positions ranging from a legendary or historical character, a warrior, a hero, up to an incarnation of the Supreme God. In whatever capacity he is seen, he occupies a very important place in the epic.

However, there were certain elements in his character that could not be justified, no matter whether he is a man or a god. Among these, some of the most prominent are rāsa līlā or the circular dance with the Gopis, jala kṛīḍā or water sport, vāstrāpaharana or carrying away of clothes. But the ingenuity of the Brahman either explained them away or allegorised them. As fire is not stained by feeding on impure substances, God is not stained by the violation of moral laws. Men should be moral, but gods need not be bound by morality. Siva can drink poison, but it is sure death to ordinary mortals if they attempted it. The words of gods are true, but their actions need not necessarily be so. This is the kind of explanation by which Kṛṣṇa's immoral actions are justified. Bhagavata, ^{putana} Book 10.33.26-29. Those who know something about popular Hindooish and the Kṛṣṇa cult are only too well-acquainted with the allegorising and

spiritualising of Kṛṣṇa's deeds to need further mention of them is-needed here.

In face of such facts about Kṛṣṇa several theories have grown up among scholars about his person.

Some think that the origin of Kṛṣṇa may be found in one of those early vegetation deities that have been so widely worshipped among many primitive peoples. Kṛṣṇa is associated with the renewal of life of vegetation in the Spring time. His name as Govinda is connected with cattle. His association with Bālārāma who is a god of harvest, his name Dāmodara, the god 'with a cord round his belly', supposed to be derived from ^{the} wheat-sheaf, the fact that he appeared in a 'vegetation masque' contending with Kāma for the possession of the sun, all these are put forward as proofs of the fact that he was originally a vegetation deity.

Mr. Vaidya is of opinion that Kṛṣṇa belonged to the Yādava race of Kṣattriyas who came with the second invasion of the Aryans and settled on the banks of the Jumna as a pastoral people. According to Weber and Dutt he belonged to the Pāṇḍavas originally a non-Aryan people(judged from the custom of brothers marrying one common wife). ^{the} Kṛṣṇa cult prevailed along them and by his worship they were led to victory. Later on they were admitted into the Aryan fold by the name of the Bhāratas.

Garbe holds that Kṛṣṇa was the son of Vāsudeva who founded a monotheistic and ethical religion about two hundred years before Sākyanani

Buddha and was subsequently ~~been~~ deified and identified with ~~the~~ god Vāsudeva whose worship he founded. Sir R. G. Bhandarkar thinks that Kṛṣṇa was a boy-god worshipped by a nomadic non-Aryan tribe of cowherds of unrefined manners known as Nohiras. The stories of Kṛṣṇa's sensual life must have been derived from

these people. (Radhakrishnan, Indian Philosophy. p 493-494.)

There are elements in the Kṛṣṇa legend and history to justify all these various theories and perhaps many more.

Kṛṣṇa is traced back to the Rg-Vedic period. In the Rg-Veda we see two Kṛṣṇas. One of them is an Aryan and the other a non-Aryan. In a passage in the Rg-Veda the non-Aryan Kṛṣṇa is described as a great chief waiting with a great army outside to fight India. It is likely that Weber and Dutt based their theory of Kṛṣṇa mainly on account of this legend.

The Aryan Kṛṣṇa of the Rg-Veda is one of the Vedic ṛsis, the composer of the 74th hymn of the 8th Maṇḍala. He speaks of himself as Kṛṣṇa in the 3rd and the 4th verses and is supposed to be a descendant of the Āngiras. There is no Kṛṣṇa mentioned till we come to the Upaniṣads. In Chāndogya 3:17 a Kṛṣṇa, son of Devaki, appears. He is a pupil of Ṛṣi Ghora, who was an Āngirasa. Later, he was considered as an expounder of the theology of the Upaniṣads, and as a spiritual teacher. But there is nothing to indicate that he is not a warrior. There is a tradition about Kṛṣṇa as a sage from the time of the Rg-Vedic hymns to the time of the Chāndogya Upaniṣad. This tradition, says R. G. Bhandarkar, gave rise to the identification of Kṛṣṇa with Vāsudeva when the former was raised to rank of supreme deity. He is called Vāsudeva-Kṛṣṇa. Sir ^{R.G.} Bhandarkar gives the explanation of the identification of Kṛṣṇa with Vāsudeva as follows.

Vāsudeva belonged to the Kārṣṇāyana Gotra and hence he is called Kṛṣṇa. Having been known by that name he was easily engrafted ^{upon} to the tradition of the old Kṛṣṇa, the son of Devaki, with his spiritual insight and learning. In Saṃśāparva 36, Mīśa-



gives the reason for bestowing highest honours to Kṛṣṇa as knowledge of the Vedas, and his place as a sacrificial priest. It was no new thought to the Hindoo mind to identify two gods and call them by one name. The Vāsudeva of the Bhāgavatas and the Kṛṣṇa of the Vedas and of the Upaniṣads became Vāsudeva-Kṛṣṇa.

We ^{have} already noted Kṛṣṇa's identification with Gopāla-Kṛṣṇa, the cowherd god. Most of the immoral stories about him (probably of a non-Aryan source) came from this identification. On the other hand Vāsudeva was also identified with Narāyaṇa, one of the oldest gods, developed, according to Sir. R. G. Bhandarkar, during the period of later Brāhmaṇas and Āranyakas. We need not go into further details of the identification of Kṛṣṇa and Vāsudeva with other gods.

Vāsudeva-Kṛṣṇa is identified with Viṣṇu. The latter is an old Vedic god. Though only a few hymns are addressed to him in the Rg-Veda he is by no means an unimportant god. The Vedic seer describes with enthusiasm his long strides and the three steps by which he measures the universe. His first two steps can be discerned and approached by men, but the third no one can transgress. It is even beyond the flight of birds. R.V.1.155,5. The wise see the highest place of Viṣṇu as it were an eye fixed in the heaven. R.V.1.22.20. In the highest place of Viṣṇu there is a well of honey and there the gods rejoice. R.V.1.154.5. He is a friend and helper of Indra.

Viṣṇu rose to greater importance during the time of the Brāhmaṇas and took the position of the Supreme Spirit during the epic and the puranic periods. In A.B.1.1. and S.B.14.1.1 Agni is regarded as the lowest of the gods and Viṣṇu as the highest. In S.B.14.1,2,5. miraculous powers are attributed to

Viṣṇu. In the Upanisads also Viṣṇu has a great place. In Maitri Upanisad 6:13 food is called the form of Bhagavad Viṣṇu which sustains the universe. In Kathāupanisad 3:3 the end of the human soul is Viṣṇu. Thus Viṣṇu grew to be in every respect the Supreme Spirit. But ^{it} is neither Viṣṇu's supreme place as a god nor his majesty that gave him grip over the hearts of men. It was his condescension. "It is perhaps because he differed in this respect from Varuna that it was to Viṣṇu that the power was finally transferred which Varuna lost. The grace of Varuna to the sinner is only a vague affirmation, a hope, a conjecture; while Viṣṇu, according to the legend, had once by a definite work of deliverance manifested his willingness, as well as his power to help men in their extremity." MacNicol's Indian Theism, P.34.

The conception of avatāra had already taken hold of men's minds. When once the legend about Viṣṇu was deeply rooted, it was easy for people to identify the object of their worship, whether Vāsudeva or Kṛṣṇa or Vāsudeva-Kṛṣṇa with Viṣṇu.

It was common in Vedic times to identify two gods. But they did not think of identifying a god and a man. With the idea of avatāra, this sort of identification took place. Gods act like human beings and sometimes even as lower animals though they retain the miraculous powers of gods. There are legends in which gods took the form of a man or a beast or a fish and yet did not lose god-like qualities.

On the other hand there were men who possessed extraordinary powers and hence after their death were raised to the position of deities. The idea worked both ways and hence it was easy to identify Viṣṇu who took the form of man and Vāsudeva-Kṛṣṇa who was deified. Vāsudeva-Kṛṣṇa became the avatāra of Viṣṇu.

Thus the theistic tendency that was seen all along in the Hindoo thought now became very prominent. Viṣṇu manifested himself as Vāsudeva-Kṛṣṇa to put down unrighteousness and to uphold righteousness. But somehow or other, Vāsudeva was gradually dropped out of account. Kṛṣṇa's heroism and his leadership appealed to the common man. The ^{sp}ere of his influence and worship began to widen till it became almost universal in India.

The mind of the philosopher too was working along the same lines. We already noted the place that Viṣṇu occupied in ^{the} *Mitri* and *Kathāpaniṣads*

The main trend of the *Upaniṣads* was monistic. The idea of the Brahman is in the main impersonal according to the *Upaniṣadic* thinkers. But even among them there was a theism at work. It was inevitable that this strain of theism in the *Upaniṣads* should coalesce with the spiritual elements of a theistic faith. But beyond this it could not go. The *Upaniṣads* did not attempt to effect a union between the Brahman on whom 'the universe is woven like pearls on a thread' and a personal God who is near to men and dear to their hearts.

This is what the *Gītā* has tried to accomplish. It has attempted to effect a fusion between the two conceptions -- the conception of the monistic Brahman of the *Upaniṣads* with the *avatār* conception of Viṣṇu. But the fusion is necessarily incomplete. The result is a general obscurity about the book. Perhaps that accounts for its popularity. The *Gītā* has given satisfaction to every cult and creed. Kṛṣṇa has become everybody and everything for the sake of 'saving all'. He is Vāsudeva. He is the Vedic seer and the epic hero. He is also the cowherd god. He is the great god Viṣṇu. Last, but not the least, he is the imperishable, eternal Brahman.

The similarity of the development of these conceptions about the person of Krsna to the Christ of the Fourth Gospel is evident, though the differences are as striking as the similarity.

The Fourth Gospel writer starts with the historical Jesus. He could not start with anything else. He is the Jesus that walked on this earth doing good to people in Judaea, Galilee and Samaria and revealing God to men. He is the great religious teacher of monotheism like Vasudeva; a great friend of all especially the twelve. It would be very significant ~~that~~⁴ the beloved disciple who leaned on the breast of Jesus was himself the writer of the Fourth Gospel. Whether he was or not, the historical Jesus was a vital experience in his life. No other incentive was needed except the mere memory of the great personality of this teacher and friend to look up to him in reverence, adoration, faith, love, and worship. The historical Jesus had such a grip on the mind, heart and will of the writer. He could not forget him as the Jesus who walked and taught and performed miracles by the power of his personality.

But to the writer Jesus is not the mere Jesus of Nazareth. He is the promised Messiah, the one that the prophets proclaimed with an unmistakable voice, the one that the Jewish world was looking forward to with eager expectation for deliverance. He is the "Wonderful, Counsellor, the Mighty God, the everlasting Father, the Prince of Peace." Is.9:6. Except for the prologue this is almost the first impression that the evangelist conveys to his readers. "We have found the Messias, which is being interpreted, the Christ." 1:41. The whole Gospel is practically a vindication of this position that Jesus is the Christ, the

promised Messiah. Most of the miracles in the Fourth Gospel are chosen with this purpose in mind. The discourses of Jesus are not as those of the Sermon on the Mount, but discourses to vindicate to the Jews that he is the Messiah that their fathers and they expected. "Your father Abraham rejoiced to see my days and he saw it and was glad" 8:56. "Before Abraham was I am." 8:58. "Moses has written about me." The identification of the Jesus of Nazareth with the Messiah is effected convincingly by the writer. He does not leave any doubt in the minds of the readers as to Jesus' claim to be the Messiah. The record of the Synoptic writers centers round the work of the Jesus of Nazareth though they do not fail to point out that he is 'the Son of Man'. But the record of the Fourth Gospel writer centers round the work of the Messiah, though it is based on the historical Jesus.

The parallel is clear between the identification of Vāsudeva and Kṛṣṇa on the one hand and Jesus and Christ on the other. The historical Vāsudeva is identified with the Kṛṣṇa of the Vedic Upanisadic and the epic traditions. In the Gita, the historical nucleus Vāsudeva is in the background and Kṛṣṇa is the important figure. So also, in the Fourth Gospel, Jesus of Nazareth is in the background. Everything centers round the Christ, the Messiah, ^{the fulfilment} of the age-long eager hope and expectation of the Jews.

The writer of the Fourth Gospel wants to prove that Jesus is not only the Messiah, but also that he is the Son of God. In the Gospel the terms the Messiah and the Son of God are not equivalent. The Son of God is more than the Jewish Messiah who is to be the fulfilment of the Jewish hopes. Jesus is the Son of God, the Saviour of the world. "These are written that ye might believe that Jesus is (not only) the Christ (the Messiah), (but

also) the Son of God; and that believing ye might have life through his name." 20:31. "Rabbi, thou art the Son of God," starts even as early as the first Chapter. 1:49. While the Synoptics use the phrase, 'the Son of Man' to indicate the Messiahship of Jesus, the Fourth Gospel writer generally uses the term 'the Christ' to indicate the same title. But the Synoptics seldom use the phrase 'the Son of God' which the Fourth Gospel writer constantly uses. No doubt, the writer speaks of men as sons(children). But the sonship of Jesus is of a unique sense. "He is the fulfilment of the world's hope in and longing for, not only a Messiah, but for God himself." (The Fourth Gospel, ^{P.13.} Strachan.) The effort of the writer is to prove the divinity, nay, the deity of Jesus. But his Jewish idea of monotheism is so strong that he does not identify the Son of God with God himself. The very term son indicates that he is separate from the Father, that he has a lower position. Yet Jesus' sense of unity with the Father in purpose, will and life is so strong that he says, "I and my Father are one."

Kṛṣṇa is identified with Viṣṇu, the old Vedic God. He is an avatār of Viṣṇu. We have discussed the nature of this identification elsewhere. (P.49) There is no such strong element of monotheism in Hindooism as would stand in the way of a complete identification of Kṛṣṇa and Viṣṇu. But Jewish monotheism could never allow such a position. Jesus could never claim that he is the Yahweh, in spite of his unity with God. He is Yahweh's Son in a unique sense, though he never uses the term Yahweh in speaking about God. He is sent by God and there is an identity with him and God that no one else has. Therefore knowing him means knowing the Father. "If ye had known me, ye should have known my Father

also." 8:19. "I proceed forth and came from God." 8:42. Thus though he is shown to be an incarnation of God, he never calls himself God unlike the Kṛṣṇa of the *Gītā*.

The Fourth Gospel writer does not stop here. The hero of his book is Jesus, the Messiah(the Christ), the Son of God. But he is also the Logos. We shall discuss the conception of the Logos more fully in the next chapter. Here we may just note that in the interests of the philosophically-minded readers he has introduced Jesus who is the Messiah and the Son of God as the eternal Logos made flesh. But the writer does not say anything about the Logos except in the prologue. He does not spoil the purpose of the book by unnecessarily mixing it up with the Greek metaphysical speculation. He has an unmistakable conviction and experience that Jesus is the Messiah, the Son of God, and it is the real message that he wants to carry across to the readers. Therefore after introducing the subject in terms of Greek philosophy, he leaves the Logos there and proceed in the rest of the book with Jesus who is the Messiah and the Son of God.

Here, the comparison and the contrast between the *Gītā* and the Fourth Gospel is very evident. Kṛṣṇa who is identified with Viṣṇu of the Vedas is also identified with the Brahman of the Upaniṣads. But monotheism and monism do not go well together. Yet this is what the *Gītā* has attempted to do with the result that the *Gītā*'s religion is shrouded in a mist of monistic philosophy and its philosophy itself is made very inconsistent. This sort of 'mixing up of things' should not be attributed to the original writer. It is, as we saw before, the work of later hands who had motives other than that of upholding pure theistic worship. However, the Fourth Gospel is free from all such things.

Neither the religious conviction, nor the spiritual message that the book carries is in any way affected by any philosophical theories of his or of later writers. After leaving the Logos once, he never turns back to it. But the theistic Kṛṣṇa-Viṣṇu is hopelessly mixed up with the monistic Brahman. The Logos is seen only once; but the Brahman pervades the whole atmosphere of the Gītā.

To put in table form and to sum up all that we discussed till now,

Vāsudeva	:	Jesus
Kṛṣṇa	:	Christ
Viṣṇu	:	(The Son of) God
Brahman	:	Logos.

The historical nucleuses are Vāsudeva and Jesus. But the former was almost dropped out of account when the real Kṛṣṇa cult prevailed. This is not so in the case of Jesus. The theory of the person of Christ, the Son of God, is built on the historic Jesus. The Gītā in its completed form does not attempt to build itself on the historical Vāsudeva. The hero of the Gītā is Kṛṣṇa though Vāsudeva is referred to a few times -- perhaps ~~on account of the~~ survival from the old theistic verson. Kṛṣṇa is all important. And we might ask the question again, who is he? We traced his origin. But how far he is historical, and how far he is worthy of the position that he holds in the Gītā is difficult to judge.

We at once notice the difference between the Kṛṣṇa of the Gītā and the Christ of the Fourth Gospel. They look so alike. Yet they are so unlike. If the Kṛṣṇa is the Kṛṣṇa of the Purāṇa of 'violent deeds and doubtful company' he comes no where near

the Christ. If he is the Kṛṣṇa of the epic then too no comparison can be drawn. These Kṛṣṇas may be historic, but they possess no character. The Kṛṣṇa of the Vedas and of the Upaniṣads is also only a vague and almost a mythical person. On the other hand, if he is the ideal Kṛṣṇa of the Gītā, he has resemblance to Christ. But the ideal cannot be historical. However the attempt among many Hindoos today is in the direction of presenting an ideal and not a historic Kṛṣṇa. Thus a Hindoo says, "If it were not erroneously believed, as is done, almost universally in this country, that the highly spiritual teachings of the Gītā were imparted by the Kṛṣṇa of the Mahabharata and the Purāṇas, people -- at any rate thoughtful and right-minded people -- would not care a straw for that Kṛṣṇa. But why should one believe that those teachings are his? Evidently, they belong to the author of the Gītā, whoever he may be, and their ascription to Kṛṣṇa, the popular god and hero, is a mere setting intended to make them attractive. When we see in this light the relation of the Gītā to the epic and purāṇic Kṛṣṇa, the latter's life and character, as depicted by our poets, cease to be of any concern to us and we are spared both the humiliation of defending and explaining an indefensible character and the trouble of decrying it." (Raja Surya Rao Lectures by Tattavabhusan, P. 81-82.)

Before we close this chapter it will be worth while for us to compare the divinity that is attributed to the Kṛṣṇa of the Gītā and the Christ of the Fourth Gospel, because it forms the most important feature of their personalities. They are both made to claim extra-ordinary divine attributes more than any other sage or saint ever claimed. Kṛṣṇa identifies himself with

Visnu and with Brahman.

He is the Ancient, the Omnipotent, the All-Ruler, minuter than the minute, the supporter of all, of form unimaginable, resplendent as the sun beyond the darkness. 11:8-9. He is the One and the manifold everywhere present. 9:15. "I the oblation, I the sacrifice, I the ancestral offering, I the fire-giving herb, the mantram I." 9:16. He is the deity of deities. 11:13. In his transfigured form Arjuna sees everything in him even Brahma. "Within thy form O God, the gods I see, all grades of beings with distinctive marks; Brahma, the Lord upon his lotus-throne, the Rsis all, and serpents, the divine. With mouths, eyes, arms, breasts multitudinous, I see thee everywhere, unbounded form. Beginning, middle, end, nor source of thee, Infinite Lord, Infinite form I find. Shining a mass of splendour everywhere, with discus..... Eternal Dharma's changeless Guardian thou; as immemorial man I think of thee." 11:15-18. It is thus in the process of transfiguration that Arjuna sees in Krsna all the attributes of a transcendent and an immanent God. "With many mouths and eyes, with many visions of marvel, with many divine ornaments, with many upraised divine weapons, wearing divine necklaces and vestures, anointed with divine unguents, the God all marvellous, boundless, with face turned everywhere. If the splendour of a thousand suns were to blaze out together in the sky, that might resemble the glory of that Mahatman. The Pundava beheld the whole universe divided into manifold parts, standing in One, in the body of the Deity of Deities." 11:10-13. It is not possible for mortal eyes to see Krsna's original form. Therefore Krsna gives to Arjuna divine eyes. Having seen Krsna's true form, Arjuna is overwhelmed with astonishment, and he bows

his head to the Shining One and worships him, and asks for forgiveness and mercy. "Mercy O God! refuge of all the worlds!" 11:25. "I worship thee have mercy God Supreme!" 11:31.

There is no end to Kṛṣṇa's attributes, 10:9, and no end to his divine power, 10:40. He is the first cause and Brahma himself is less great than he, 11:37a. "Infinite God of gods, none of all worlds, imperishing, sat, asat, That Supreme. First of the gods, most ancient man thou art, supreme receptacle of all that lives; knower and known, the dwelling place on high; in thy vast form the universe is spread. Thou art Vayu, Yama, Agni, moon, Varuna, Father, Grandsire of all. Hail....O All. In power boundless, measureless in strength, thou beholdest all: then thou thyself art all" 11:37b-40. Kṛṣṇa is the highest energy pervading all, sustaining the three worlds, the indestructible Lord, the supreme spirit. 15:17-18. "Know thou this to be the womb of all beings. I am the source of the forth-going of the whole universe and like-wise the place of its dissolving. There is naught whatsoever higher than I, O Dhananjaya. All this is threaded on me, as rows of pearls on a string. I the sapidity in waters.... I the radiance in moon and sun; the Word of power in all the Vedas, sound in ether, and virility in men....Know me, O Partha! as the eternal seed of all beings. I am the Reason of the Reason-endowed, the splendour of splendid things am I. And I the strength of the strong, devoid of desire and passion. In beings I am desire not contrary to duty O Lord of Bhāratas" 7:6-11. "That is greater than the reason is He" 3:42. He is the generator of all and all evolves from him. 10:8. He is the creator, the preserver, and the sustainer of all things. "My womb is the great eternal. In that I place the germ; thence cometh the birth of all beings." 14:3.

"I give heat; I hold back and send forth rain; immortality and also death, being and non-being am I Arjuna". 9:19. There are life-giving words in him. 10:18. He is the abode of the Eternal, and of the indestructible nectar of immortality, of the immemorial righteousness and of unending bliss. 14:27.

Compare with these claims the passages in the Fourth Gospel that set forth the divinity of Jesus. The writer, as we saw before, begins with the Logos. The Logos was with God and the Logos was God(divine). The same was in the beginnig with God. All things were made by him. His Life was the light of men. There were several manifestations of the Logos in this world. But they were not enough. Therefore the Logos took flesh and dwelt among men and that is the historical Jesus.

This Jesus is the Christ, the promised Messiah, the Son of God in a special sense. The charge of the Jews against him is that he made himself God. "We mean to stone you not for a good deed, but for blasphemy, because you a mere man, make yourself God" 10:33. "Do you mean to tell me, who the Father consecrated and sent into the world, 'You are blaspheming' because I said 'I am God's Son'.....The Father is in me and I am in the Father" 10:34-38. Thus from Jesus'mouth we get his extraordinary claims to divinity. "I am the bread of life; he who comes to me will never be hungry, and he who believes in me will never be thirsty again." 6:35. "It is the will of my Father that every one who sees the Son and believes on him should possess eternal life" 6:40. "Truly, truly I tell you, the believer has eternal life." 6:47. "I am the living bread which has come down from heaven, if any one eats of this bread, he will live for ever....He who feeds on my flesh and drinks my blood possesses eternal life.

6:51;54. "He who feeds on this bread will live for ever." 6:58. "The words I have uttered to you are spirit and life." 6:63. "The Father loves the Son and shows him all that he is doing himself. He will show him still greater deeds than these, to make you wonder, for as the Father raises the dead and make them live, so the Son makes any one live whom he chooses. Indeed the Father passes judgment on no one. He has committed the judgment which determines life or death entirely to the Son, so that all men may honour the Son as they honour the Father..... Truly, truly I tell you, he who listens to my word and believes him who sent me has eternal life. He will incur no sentence of judgment. He has already passed from death across to life. Truly, truly I tell you the time is coming, it has come already, when the dead will listen to the voice of the Son of God, and those who listen will live; for as the Father has life in himself, so too he has granted the Son to have life in himself, and also granted him authority to act as judge, since he is the Son of man. Do not wonder at this; for there is a time coming when all who are in the tombs will listen to his voice and come out, they that have done good to the resurrection of life, and they that have done evil to the resurrection of damnation." 5:20-29. "I have not come of my own initiative; I am sent, and sent by him who is Real. I know him because I have come from him and he sent me.". 7:28-29. "I go to him who sent me.... Where I go you cannot come." 7:33-34.

"If any one is athirst, let him come to me and drink. He who believes on me, out of his body.... streams of living water will flow." 7:37-38. "I am the light of the world; he who follows me will not walk in darkness. He will enjoy the light of life." 8:12.

"If the Son sets you free, you will be really free." 8:36.

"Truly truly I tell you, if any one holds to what I say, he will never see death." 8:51. "I am the Light of the world." 9:6.

"I am the shepherd of the sheep..... I am the Gate; who ever enters by me will be saved..... I have come that they may have life and have it to the full. I am the good shepherd..... I know my sheep and my sheep know me..... I lay down my life to take it up again..... I lay it down of my own accord. I have power to lay it down and also power to take it up again" 10:7-18.

"I am myself resurrection and life; he who believes in me will live, even if he dies, and no one who lives and believes in me will ever die". 11:25,26. "He who beholds me, beholds him who sent me." 12:45. "He who has seen me has seen the Father." 14:9.

"I and my Father are one." 10:30. "I have not come to judge the world, but to save the world.... I am the real and the living way. No one comes to the Father except by means of me. If you know me you would know my Father also." 14:6,7. "Thou hast granted him power over all flesh to give eternal life to all whom thou hast given him." 17:2.

The similarity is as close as it can be. Yet the difference looks like the difference between fiction and fact. Examining the facts, no one can hold that either Kṛṣṇa or Christ could have made such extraordinary claims. But if any such claims could be made, it could be done neither by the Kṛṣṇa of the Vedas, Upaniṣads, Purāṇas or epic, nor by the ideal Kṛṣṇa of the Gītā, but by Christ who actually lived and walked on this earth revealing God in his own person.

Chapter 4.

The Eternal Order -- The Brahman and The Logos.

In the last chapter we saw the identification of Kṛṣṇa with the Brahman on the one hand and of Christ with the Logos on the other. We also saw that the Brahman and the Logos were parallel conceptions. Perhaps it is better to call them the same conception of the Eternal Order with two different names.

The writers of the Gītā ~~or~~^{and} the Fourth Gospel by no means originated this conception. It is much older.

In India the conception of the Eternal Order started with the Vedas themselves. In Greece it is as old as Herakleitos, if not older. However, the conception started in a definite form as the Logos with Herakleitos. Before we discuss the idea of the Brahman and of the Logos in the Gītā and the Fourth Gospel, it would be well for us to trace them back to their sources and examine briefly their development.

In the Rg-Veda the conception of the Eternal Order starts with Rta which is associated with Varuna. Varuna has a law and it is called the Rta which primarily meant the order of the world. Rta is the father of all, and it exists before the manifestation of the worlds. The worlds and their beings are an expression of the Rta which remains unchanged. The universe is its shadow or reflexion. "The Maruts came from afar from the seat of Rta" 4:21,3. "Viṣṇu is the embryo of the Rta." 1:156.3. Heaven and earth follow a fixed order because of the Rta. 10:121.1. The cosmic order is thus attributed to the will of the supreme God. Even the gods cannot transgress the Rta, much less the worlds.

Rta soon became the law of morality and of righteousness

as well. Varuna with his companion Mitra became the custodians of the moral order as they were of the physical order. The prayer of the worshipper is "Lead us on to the path of Rta." 10:133.6. Thus Rta answers for the law and order in the moral as well as the physical worlds. We may also note that Rta is an Indo-Iranian conception and is the precursor of dharma. The Rta is to be obeyed by nature, gods and men. It is the universal essence of things. It is satya or truth. The good are those who follow the Rta.

Among the gods and goddesses that appear in the Rg-Veda two or three^{more} are significant for our purpose. Among these are the Vāk, the goddess of speech and Sakti, the energy of God and Tvastr sometimes identified with Savitr, the "matter" of the world, though sometimes he is represented as doing the creative functions. The first two are goddesses and are very significant in the development of the later Brahman idea. A prayer to Sakti runs as follows:- "Come thou, O goddess, that grantest our prayers, Thou art the unperishing, the equal of Brahman." Tait. Ar. 10:34.52. From Vāk the Vedas came forth. Vāk is the mother of the Vedas. Sabda, articulate sound is of similar significance. It is eternal. Later on it came to be both eternal and non-eternal, eternal as thought and non-eternal as sound. It also came to have a rational and a sensuous aspect. The sacred word "Aum" is also of equal importance.

In the Atharva Veda we see another name Skambha or support who is the ultimate principle. He is called also Prājāpati, Puruṣa, Brahman. He includes in himself all space, time, gods, Vedas, and moral powers.

In the Brāhmaṇas, Brahmanaspati is the lord of prayer. Brahman in the Rg-Veda meant a hymn or a prayer to god. Now

Brahman became the object prayed for and also one to whom propitiation was offered. Later on it became the power of sacrifice. In the Brāhmaṇas the whole universe arose out of sacrifice. Hence Brahman became the creative principle of the world. "Verily in the beginning this universe was the Brahman; it created the gods." Sat. Brah. 11:2.3.1.

The Upaniṣads developed the idea of the Brahman fully. They also describe him as Vāc or speech. Brahma, verily is speech(Vac). Its seat is just speech. Brih. Ar. 4:1.2. The highest Brahman is in truth speech. He is known as Sabda as well.

Brahman is the one reality. He is ever active, ever resting. "That from which these beings are born, that in which when born they live, and that into which they enter at their death, that is Brahman." He is the Ātman(Self).

The One God hidden in all things,
All pervading, the Inner Soul of all things,
.....in all things abiding,
The One God who covers himself,
Like a spider with threads.

Svet. 6:7-13.

"That which is the finest essence -- this whole world has that as its soul. That is reality. That is Ātman. That art thou, Svetaketu." Chand. 6:9-13.

"The Ātman which pervades all things,
As butter contained in cream,
.....
This is Brahma, the highest mystic teaching,
.....

Svet.2:5;15-16.

"That God, All worker, the Great Soul,
Ever seated in the heart of creatures."

" 4:11-20.

Brahman is the Light.

"In the highest golden sheath,
Is Brahma, without stain, without parts,
Brilliant is It, the Light of lights....." Mund.2:2.9.

He is prāṇa(life). He is nānas or perpetual consciousness. He is Vijnāna or intelligence. Ait.3:3. Tait. 3:5. He is also Ananda.

From It all things flow, by It all things are sustained, and unto It all things dissolve. It is independent of everything; but everything is dependent on It. Every thing hangs on It, and It hangs on nothing. "As all spokes are contained in an axle, and in the felly of a wheel, thus also, all beings and all gods, all worlds and all organs, also are contained in thatself."

Brih. 2:5.15. "There is that ancient tree whose roots grow upward, and whose branches grow downward. That is the bright Brahman, the immortal, all worlds are contained in it, and no one goes beyond It." Kātha. 2:6.1. Tait. 1:10. Also see B.G.15.1.

We often see the concept of Puruṣa. It is an old concept. Originally it meant the material out of which the world was created. But later on Puruṣa became active. He was the creator as well. "From the Puruṣa Virāt was born, and from Virāt again Puruṣa." Puruṣa is thus the creator as well as the created body.

In speaking about the Brahman we designated the concept as It and He. Could we thus designate the Brahman? Both are right, and can find its support from the Upaniṣads. We can describe Brahman as prāna, or manas, or vijñāna, or even as ānanda. But the ultimate reality is also indefinable. "Neti, neti," (not thus, not so) is all that we can say about it.

The reason for this difference is to be found in the Upaniṣadic seers themselves. They were mystics of a very high intellectual type. Most of them had an experience of an identity with Brahman. Sometimes they could describe him and sometimes they could not. In their moods of ecstasy they described the highest reality as Ānanda, though they themselves felt that he is indefinable. hence they called it neti, neti. They felt it, they knew it, but it is indescribable. It is beyond thought, it is beyond words. They themselves could not be sure that they exhausted it.

From this arose the distinction of the later schools of the Nirguna Brahman and the Sa una Brahman, Kārana Brahman and Kārya Brahman, Para Brahman and īvara. We shall see later the close resemblance of these conceptions with the God and the Logos idea of Philo and of the Fourth Gospel writer. However, we may note here that the first of these pairs resemble roughly the God or the Father and the second of these pairs resemble the Word, the Logos or the Son before he took flesh. The parallel is not by any means exact. The Nirguna, Kārana, or Para Brahman is the primal, indescribable Essence, beyond time and space and their limitations. Saguna or Kārya Brahman or Isvara is in the idea of the world of time and space, but existing eternally in the Nirguna, Kārana, or Para Brahman. All ^{the} created world is nothing but a manifestation, an unfolding of the Saguna Brahman. Everything is a part of the Saguna Brahman, hence we might say, a part also of the Nirguna Brahman. The Nirguna Brahman manifests itself in the world only through the activity of the Saguna Brahman.

The Ultimate Reality as ānanda is the highest conceivable in the experience of man. The Nirguna Brahman is inconceivable. Ānanda is the Prāmānika Satta or the Real revealed to thought, and experience. The Nirguna Brahman free from all predicates, without qualities is the Nirupānika Satta. The later exponents of these theories were Rāmānuja and Saṅkarācharya respectively. Both found their support in the Upanisads.

The Upanisads say, "There are assuredly two forms of Brahman, the formed and the formless, the mortal and the immortal, the stationary and the moving, the actual and the yon." Brh.2:3.1.

The formless is the Nirguna Brahman and the formed the Saguna Brahman. The former is described by "Not thus, not so (neti, neti) for there is nothing higher than this, that it is thus. Now the designation of him is 'the Real of the real.' Brh.2:3.6. Gargi is warned not to question about it too much lest her head fall off (she might not become crazy). 3.6. See also 3.8.8-9. 1:4.11; 3:9.11. The latter is "the shining immortal Purusa (person) who is in this earth, and with reference to oneself this shining immortal Purusa who is in the body -- he indeed is just this Ātman (Self), this immortal, this Brahman, this All." 2:5.1. See also 2:5.15; 3:4.1. He is one "who dwelling in the earth, yet is other than the earth, whom the earth does not know, whose body the earth is, who controls the earth from within. He is your Ātman, the Inner Controller, the Immortal." 7:3.3. (All the above references are from Brhad Aranyaka Upanisad.)

In the Bhagavad Gītā, which in its completed form is intended to be a 'layman's Upanisad' the distinction between the quality-less and the quality Brahman is implied though not expressly stated any more than in the Upanisads. The Brahman of the Gītā is that in whom even the Brahma, the Lord, upon his lotus throne exists. 11:15. "Infinite, God of gods, unperishing, Sat, Asat, that Supreme! He is pre-existent, unborn, beginningless." Yet the work of ^{redemption} is taken not by this Nirguna Brahma but by the Saguna Brahman who became incarnate in the person of Kṛṣṇa. Many births he left behind him. 17:26. He is born from age to age. He emanates the world. 9:8.

Before we go any further, we shall examine the origin and development of the Logos idea in Greece and its subsequent growth and modification in the Jewish and the Christian worlds.

The idea of the Logos may have been in Greek thought much earlier than Herakleitos. But it took definite shape with that thinker of the 6th Century B. C. Some hold that the idea went over to Greece, to Persia, and to Egypt through the Buddhist missionaries from India. It may or may not be so. However Herakleitos was the first thinker in Greece who definitely formulated the conception of the Logos. He broke away from the purely physical conceptions that had hitherto prevailed by stating a principle of reason in the world order. He says,

"Having hearkened not unto me, but to the Logos, it is wise to confess that all things are one." Fr.1.

"This Logos is always existent, (unlike physical things) but men fail to understand it both before they have heard it and when they have heard it for the first time. For although all things happen through this Logos, men seem as if they have no acquaintance with it when they make acquaintance with such works and words as I expound; dividing each thing according to its nature, and explaining how it really is. The rest of mankind (all except Herakleitos) are unconscious of what they do when awake, just as they forget what they do when asleep." Fr.2.

Thus, Herkleitos speaks as one having authority. He holds himself to be the pioneer of a new truth which no one saw or held before as he did. But somehow or other his philosophy of the Logos was entangled with the physical hypothesis of the earlier times. Hence it had very little influence on the greater systems of Greek thought.

Plato and Aristotle developed the idea. Plato says, "The world is a mixed creation, resulting from a combination of Necessity and Reason..... Reason ruled Necessity by persuading her to guide the majority of things created to the best end." Tim. 47E f. Plato and Aristotle with their theory of Ideas brought about the complete separation between the physical world and the world of reality.

The work of Plato and Aristotle is of great significance in the development of the Logos idea, but it belongs in itself to a different philosophical movement.

The next important development of the ^{idea} came with the Stoics. They abandoned the theory of the super-sensible archetypes and returned to the simple hypothesis of Heraclitus that the universe is pervaded all through with the principle of the eternal Logos. They tried to bridge the gulf between the world of reality and the world of phenomena. They held that man may lift himself above his limitations and realise his identity with the Logos which resides in his own soul, and which is also the governing principle of the whole universe. The Logos as it exists in man utters itself in speech which is denoted by the same word logos. The Logos on the one hand is reason in its inner movement and potentiality, and on the other it is reason projected and made concrete in the world and the variety of things in it.

Philo of Alexandria, a Jewish thinker, gave the Logos a new turn when he combined the Stoic speculation with the Hebrew thinking. He was a Hebrew brought up in the traditions of his fathers to conceive of God as absolutely transcendent, which conception separated God altogether from the world. But it did not satisfy the thinking minds among the Hebrews. Therefore in the Old Testament and much more in the rabbinical thought, we trace the idea of an intermediary or intermediaries between God and the world. 'Wisdom' in Job and Proverbs is described as God's agent. "The Lord by Wisdom has founded the earth; by understanding hath he established the heavens." Pro. 3:19. Of much greater significance is the term 'Word' in the Old Testament. 'Word' was personified. By his 'Word' God created heaven and earth

and revealed himself to his prophets. He mediated his action through his divine Word. Another idea of almost similar significance is the idea of the Son of God, the Anointed, the Messiah.

Philo identified the "Word" of the Old Testament with the Greek Logos. He loosened the Stoic Logos from its materialism and harmonised it 'with a thorough-going Platonism, which regards the visible things as only the types and shadows of realities laid up in the higher world.' Again, unlike the Stoic Logos, the Logos of Philo had an independent existence. It is separate from the world of matter though it creates the world of matter. To the Stoic mind, the Logos was merely the principle of reason. To Philo, it was more than that. It was divine energy. All things were created by his 'Word'. The Word was dynamic. Once more, to the Greek mind Logos was an ultimate principle. Infinite reason took place of the divine creator. For Philo, on the other hand, the Logos was not absolute. God was the ultimate principle, and the Logos was subordinated to him. The Logos was God's reason working in accordance with his being and will. Thus Philo attempted to bring the Hebrew idea of the 'Word' who is an agent of God into harmony with the Greek Logos that is immanent in the world. The peculiarity of Philo's doctrine of the Logos comes out of this attempt to reconcile the Hebrew and the Greek ideas. Therefore, sometimes he describes the Logos as an aspect of the activity of God, and at other times as a 'second God' who is independent and personal. However, without being able to effect a reconciliation between the two ideas, he "covers it with a confusion of words" and seems to assign to the Logos a semi-independent existence.

The writer of the Fourth Gospel found the Philonic doctrine of the Logos admirably suited to his needs, though he does not

borrow it as it is, nor follow his method. Like Philo, most probably, he himself was a Jew trained in Greek and Hebrew thinking. He takes the Philonic idea of the Logos and transforms it in such a way as to suit his purpose. That the Logos Idea is known to the readers is taken for granted.

Therefore he starts, "In the beginning was the Logos, and the Logos was with God, and the Logos was God(divine). The same was in the beginning with God. 1.2. The writer has unmistakably asserted the pre-existent nature of the Logos in these two verses, and also his full divine nature. In verse 3 we read of his creative activity. There was nothing made without him. The 4th verse presents him as life -- dynamic life that is the light of men. Verse 5 remarks about the dull understanding of ordinary men who could not comprehend this light. Then follow a few remarks about John the Baptist -- remarks that are not altogether irrelevant to the main idea. 6-8. John the Baptist came as a witness to the Logos -- the Light. John himself was not the Light; but he came to bear testimony to that Light. That was the true Light that lighteth every man that cometh into the world. 9. The writer here is anticipating the historic event ~~here~~ that is to come in verse 14. But before that he speaks a little about the general manifestation of the Logos in the world. He was in the world and the world was made by him and the world knew him not. He came unto his own and his own received him not. 10,11. It is very doubtful whether the writer is speaking about the historic Jesus here as is generally interpreted. On the other hand it is very likely that he is speaking about the general manifestation of the Logos before he took flesh, such manifestations as through the divine Wisdom, the divine Word, the prophets and the like.

But this manifestation proved to be insufficient for man's salvation. Only a few knew him and received him and to them gave he power to become the sons of God. 12. But a good many more were under the power of evil. Hence, here comes the crucial point. It was necessary for the Logos to become flesh and dwell among us with his full divine qualities of grace and truth. 14. The Baptist bears him witness and asserts his pre-existence. He was before me. 15. Verses 16 and 17 state the unprecedented boon that mankind came to receive through this unprecedented event. The prologue ends with the uniqueness of the incarnate son in his relation to the Father and in his function of revealing Him to the world.

The chief interest of the writer hereafter is not in the Logos, but in the Logos made flesh, the historic Christ who is the incarnate Saviour. The Logos is mentioned not even once in the rest of the book. That being so what are we to say about the purpose of the writer in introducing the Gospel with the Logos idea. Harnack holds that the prologue was written to conciliate the interests of the philosophic public. No doubt, Harnack is partly right. The purpose of the writer was to uphold the universal claim of Jesus. He could not do it in terms of Jewish ideas. Christianity was a much wider thing than Judaism, and the writer could no more think of Jesus merely in Hebrew terms. The Logos conception was known to the world at large, and hence he made use of it. However, the prologue ~~may~~ not seem to be an organic portion of the Gospel. Even if we leave out the prologue, the Gospel may remain unaffected to any large extent. This is to the credit of the writer. He did not want to spoil the real message

of the Gospel by unnecessarily mixing it up with Greek metaphysical speculation. He wanted to show to the Greek world that the historic Christ was the Logos of their philosophy made flesh. After doing this in the prologue he speaks in the rest of the book about his work of deliverance as he knew it and experienced it. But in dealing with the work of deliverance, the writer gives effect to the idea that the nature of Christ is essentially the Logos nature. In this five important points may be noted as given by E. F. Scott. (The Fourth Gospel, Ch. 5)

1. Great stress is laid on the miracles performed by Jesus. Miracles were signs of the divine nature of Christ. He 'manifested forth his glory' by them. The healing of the blind man is given to prove that Jesus is the Light of the world. The raising of Lazarus illustrates that he is the resurrection and the Life.

2. The writer emphasises the omniscience of Jesus. "He knew all men..... He knew what was in man." 2:24-25. He told the woman of Samaria all things that she ever did. 4:29. There is something awe-inspiring in his personality. 7:46; 12:21; 17:6. He makes himself visible and invisible as he pleases. 8:59; 9:35.

3. Jesus shows himself to be different from ordinary humanity. In the Synoptics hemingles with all classes of people, even publicans and sinners. But he does not do so here. He stands separate from the world. No body can convince him of sin. His friendship is a condescension even to the disciples.

4. Jesus has absolute freedom and self-determination about his actions. His enemies have no power over him till his 'hour' has come. He has the power to lay down his life and power to take it again. No man takes his life from him, but he lays it down himself. 10:38.

5. The words of Jesus are of great significance. "My words are spirit and life" 6:63. "Ye are clean through the words that I have spoken unto you." 15:3. "Thou hast the words of eternal life." 6:68.

Thus the prologue is not introduced without a real purpose, and it cannot be disconnected from the book without a real loss. Though the speculative idea is given up after the prologue, what the Logos stands for is given throughout the Gospel in the words and works of Christ. We might even say that the whole Gospel is an elaboration of the Logos of the prologue without its metaphysical implications.

Herein is one of the important differences between the Logos of the Fourth Gospel and the Brahman of the *Gītā*. The conception of Brahman with all its monistic and pantheistic philosophy is made a part and parcel of the *Gītā*. Kṛṣṇa, the personal Lord of the devotee is also the impersonal Absolute. Theism is overshadowed by monism. Religion is dominated by philosophy. Kṛṣṇa is not only the incarnate saviour, but also the monistic Brahman. This will be clear by an examination of the passages.

Kṛṣṇa is the "Ancient, the Omniscient, the All-Ruler8:9. the beginning of the shining ones, 10:2, Deity of Deities 11:3, Brahma, the Lord upon his lotus-throne is in him 11:5, He is the pre-existent, the unborn, beginningless. Infinite...unperishing, Sat, Asat, That supreme. 11:37. (Compare F. G. verses 1,2.) In the beginning was the Logos.....)

The prologue, Fourth Gospel.

Bhagavad Gītā.

V.3. All things were made by him.....

I am the generator of all. All evolves from me. 10:8. My womb is the great eternal. In that I place the germ; thence cometh the birth of all beings. 14:3 I am the source of the forth-going

of the whole universe...the eternal seed of all beings. 7:9. The supreme receptacle of all that lives 11:38

V.4. In him was life.....

The supreme receptacle of all that lives 11:38
I the sapidity in waters, I the radiance in the moon and the sun...virility in men.
I the fire-giving herb. 9:16.

5. And the light shineth in darkness.....

Refulgent as the sun beyond darkness 8:9.
If the splendour of a thousand suns were to blaze out together in the sky, that might resemble the glory of the Mahatman 11:12.
But no one knoweth me 17:26.

9. That was the true light.....

I, having become the fire of life take possession of the bodies of breathing things. 15:14

10. He was in the world.....

Many births have been left behind me. I am born from age to age. 17:26.
I emanate them. 9:8
No one knoweth me. 17:26.

11-13. He came to his own... but of God.

Those who are deluded by unwisdom do not receive Krsna, because they are 'bewildered by numerous thoughts, enmeshed in the web of delusion, addicted to the gratification of desire' 16:15-16.

But on the other hand those who receive Krsna, "These Mahatmas do not come to birth again... they go to the highest bliss.... having gone thither they return not." 15:6.

14. And the word was made flesh....

The Lord of all beings brooding over nature, which is mine own, yet I am born through my own power. Whenever there is a decay of righteousness, O Bharata, and there is an exaltation of unrighteousness, then I myself come forth, for the protection of the good and the destruction of the evil-doers, for the sake of firmly establishing righteousness, I am born from age to age. 4:6-7.

We detect some striking similarities between the two conceptions given above. But how the impersonal can become personal is a problem that we cannot solve in the Gītā. The Kṛṣṇa of the Gītā claims not only to be Saṅkāra Brahma but also Niṛkāra Brahma. He is born through his own māyā power. This brings us to the point of incarnation.

What is the nature of the incarnation of Kṛṣṇa? This is a very difficult question to answer. Kṛṣṇa is not born in any ordinary way. He comes into the world by the power of his own māyā. (māyā) Some take it to be 'the power of thought that produces form, which is transient and therefore unreal.' Others take it to be his creative power. Māyā power makes possible what seems impossible for us. Sankara's explanation is that he is born, that is, appear to be embodied, to be born through his māyā, but not in reality like ordinary beings. He has revealed himself in all creation. Through him all existence came into being. But he was not one of those created beings. He is eternally manifest to himself. But when he is said to manifest himself in the world he did so by the power of his own being, -māyā power. So, he knows his own self though born or seem to be like a man. It is by his own creative activity that he takes a finite individuality, and that is not real. This is one of the many explanations.

In whatever way we may explain it, the incarnation of Kṛṣṇa differs radically from the incarnation of Christ. We have already seen in Chapter 3 how far the avatāra of Kṛṣṇa is a historical event. The writer of the Fourth Gospel gives the incarnation of Christ as a definite event in history. Moreover, there is nothing unreal about his taking flesh and living among men. His relation to God is unique, but definite. Either as the Logos or as the Son of God, he has a separate individuality though he is of the same 'substance' as that of the Father. He is not born through his own power, but the Father sent him and he came forth from the Father. He cannot do anything of himself; but does those things that the Father wills. He has ^{such} a great sense of identity with God as to say "I and my Father are one". Yet he never assumes the Father's pre-

rogatives, because his Father is greater than himself. The purpose of his incarnation is to reveal the Father. "No man hath seen God at any ~~time~~ ; the only-begotten son which is in the bosom of the Father, he hath declared Him," are the words with which the prologue is ended, and the rest of the book gives a revelation of the Father in the incarnate son.

Difference is also found in the relation of men to the incarnate saviour. The divinity claimed by Kṛṣṇa sometimes is and sometimes is not the reward of the devotees. He who sees God within and without and realises that nothing can be separated from God attains to the supreme self, the self of the Brahman.

~~that~~
Brahmaphava -- becoming divine-is possible for all and is attained by many is the position of certain portions of the Gita. "Free from passion, fear and anger, absorbed in ~~me~~, purified by the fire of wisdom, many have attained my state." The individual self that realises the true Ātman by means of the Ātman is the Absolute himself.

Nevertheless, the phrases like, "attained my state", "Joy of touching Brahman," "my higher nature," "I stand supporting," all these point us to another direction. They indicate a supreme personality over against the self that strives to attain perfection. Kṛṣṇa never teaches Arjuna to call himself Kṛṣṇa. Arjuna is always the worshipper of Kṛṣṇa. Finite as finite never becomes infinite. Kṛṣṇa is the Infinite, and Arjuna is the finite. Though there is potentiality of full divinity in Arjuna, it remains potential. However much one may realise the true self, the fact remains that the individual self is the individual self. The Gītā is wavering between the two positions. We shall discuss more about this in Chapter 8.

The Fourth Gospel recognizes the divinity that is in man.

"Is it not written in your law, 'I said, ye are gods.' Yet the divine nature that the Son shares with the Father is a unique thing. He was eternally pre-existent with the Father and shared all the Father's activities even before he came into this world. He is the eternal Logos, and the eternal son of the Father. The Father consecrated him and sent him into the world. After finishing his work on earth he has gone back to the Father, and no body can go where he has gone. "Where I go, ye cannot come." Nobody can attain the divinity that Christ has eternally with the Father. Yet union with the divine is the goal of the believer. "That they also may be one in us," is the prayer of Christ for the disciples. Whatever the nature of this union is (Chapter 9.) it is different from the union of Christ with the Father.

We shall close this chapter by enumerating some of the striking resemblances between the Logos of the Fourth Gospel and the Brahman of the Gītā.

1. Both agree that somehow or other the Eternal Order reveals himself to the world. His general manifestation is seen in his universe.

2. They both hold that the Eternal Order is spiritual (though the Gītā is a little spoiled by Sāmkhya philosophy). It is by and through this Eternal Order that man attains to the higher life of the Spirit.

3. He is the agent of deliverance for this world. He does not allow unrighteousness to prevail over righteousness and evil over good. He delivers men from sin.

4. The Eternal Order took ~~took~~ flesh and dwelt among us. He is not only a divine principle or a creative reason or something

with a semi-independent personality as the Greeks or Philo considered him, but also one who assumed the shape of man.

5. Great emphasis is laid by both on Life, Light, and Love that reside in the Brahman and the Logos. They are not mere abstract reason, but divine energy, potent, life-giving.

6. Both are more concerned about the redeeming aspect of the incarnate saviour than about his creative activity or any of his other functions.

7. Finally, they both lay stress on the ultimate goal of the believer -- eternal life in and with Krsna or Christ.

Chapter 5.

Bhakti Marga -- The Way of 'Loving Devotion'.

God may be found or reached in more ways than one. Some find him by means of their intellect, while others through works. The *Gītā*, without ignoring either one of these, offers a more excellent way -- the way of Bhakti. Salvation through bhakti is the central theme of the *Gītā*.

At the very outset we must understand what bhakti means. Its translation, 'loving devotion' does not express the full meaning. The Greek terms *λαύπη* and *πίστης* put together may come closer to bhakti. As there is no single word in other languages to express its meaning we shall explain the term by unfolding its contents.

1. In the first place bhakti is used generally in a religious or a spiritual sense. It has no carnal or material element in it.

2. The object of bhakti is nothing short of the Infinite. Any kind of love, admiration or devotion to some finite object cannot be termed bhakti.

3. The Infinite is almost invariably conceived of as a person. Bhakti cannot be given to any abstract idea, a shadow or picture of our imagination or to a phantom of our minds. ^{The Infinite} He is not only a person, but a person who is the embodiment of truth, beauty and goodness. He is one who is absolutely perfect, the highest and the best being, 'Purusottama'.

4. This personal God is one who can hold fellowship with men. He is not a God that sleeps in serene abstraction while men cry

out for help. The craving of the heart of man for spiritual companionship is met by the God to whom he is devoted. There is a constant feeling together of the infinite and the finite minds.

5. There is both unity and separateness between the bhakta and the Bhagavān. They are neither altogether foreign to one another nor absolutely identical. The Bhagavān lives in the heart of the bhakta. For the bhakta the prospect of the union with the Bhagavān is a vision of delight. But however closely love may unite the lover and the beloved are two distinct persons.

6. The bhakta has an utter sense of humiliation and an absolute dependence on God. In the presence of the ideal he feels that he is only a worm in the earth. He knows he is utterly worthless apart from God. He is miserable in the absence of God. and craves for the prīti or love of God. When he discovers the supreme value of the object to which he tries to attach himself, he gives up his whole and falls at his feet. There he finds the gate of spiritual communication open to him.

7. Love to God is the strongest element in Bhakti. The Bhakta attaches himself to his Bhagavān with an unbreakable bond of love from which nothing can separate him.

8. Bhakti also means faith in God, or sraddha. God is to be taken on faith till he reveals himself in the consciousness of the bhakta.

9. Absolute self-consecration and undivided devotion are found in bhakti. The bhakta throws himself absolutely on the mercy of God. It is an open-arm^{ed} surrender. "Prostrate thyself before me.... abandoning all dharmas come unto me alone for shelter." B.C. 11:6

"Lord to whom else shall we go. Thou hast the words of eternal life." The bhakta does not only consecrates himself fully. He gives his undivided devotion to God. God becomes the ruling passion of his life. He does not desire anything else in the world. He looks only on the object of his devotion, thinks only of him, talks only about him.

10. Bhakti contains in it a true knowledge of God. It is not mere intellectual knowledge, but an intuitive knowledge.

11. Bhakti issues forth in unselfish service for God and man. The bhakta does everything for his God. "Whatsoever thou doest.. do thou that as an offering unto me." B.G.9:27.

12. Lastly, bhakti contains in it an element of hope -- hope of an eternal life, of ultimate union with God. "Thou shalt come unto me having me as thy supreme goal." B.G.9:34.

The form which bhakti generally takes is in the contemplation of the love, goodness, power and wisdom of God, constant sense of his presence, conversing about the qualities of God to others, singing his praises with devout heart and mind, doing every act as his service, ignoring ~~of~~ sense objects and the like. There is no fixed rule for all these. By these different forms the Bhakta draws near to God till he finds himself in God.

From these it is evident that Bhakti begins mainly as an emotional attachment, though it does not stop there. It is open to all alike, to the intelligent as well as the unintelligent, to the rich as well as the poor, to the learned as well as the ignorant.

Bhakti starts with a longing for the vision of God, and ends with the feeling that the individual is one with God's being.

In such feeling there is an irresistible rapture of love, joy, delight and ecstasy. The bhakta is absolutely free from the loneliness of life. He is convinced of the force of truth that God is ~~is~~ one with the universe, that He is all, "Vasudevah sarvam iti."

Thus what has begun as an emotion has issued out in knowledge. Bhakti is closely related to *jñāna* or intuitive knowledge. It is the bhakta and not the philosopher that knows God most intimately. There is a certainty about his knowledge of God almost amounting to a mathematical certainty. It is not arrived at by any logical discussion, or metaphysical speculation. The bhakta does not waste his time in fruitless discussions concerning God. He is sure about him from a first-hand intuitive knowledge of him that he gained through his bhakti. To him it is an inner experience that is self-certifying. It is its own proof-svam pramanam. Thus the highest bhakti is ~~is~~ the highest *jñāna* as well. It has not got the weakness of emotional religions because when bhakti becomes a fire that burns and consumes the whole personality, *jñāna* is obtained and the full vision of God is the result.

Again, the bhakta becomes the instrument of the divine. Hence bhakti issues forth in karma, unselfish conduct. He is one in whom the love of God has become the ruling passion that it issues forth in unselfish service and suffering for mankind. His love has become like the divine love that brought forth the universe, maintains it. It is no more he that acts, but the divine spirit with great freedom in and through him. He does not seek his own any more, nor ask for a reward for his services. Thus bhakti is closely related to *jñāna* as well as to karma.

^{the}

Bhakta is one who knows the Lord and does his will.

Bhakti is very ancient. It is as old as religion itself. We see the twilight of it even in the Vedic religion. In some of the Vedic hymns we see most of the important elements of bhakti.

Far go my thoughts (to him) as go
The eager cows that meadows seek,
Desiring him, a wide-eyed god.
Together let us walk again.

R.V. 1:25.

Again,

What has become to those our former friendships,
When we two held erstwhile unbroken converse?
O sovereign Varuna thy lofty mansion, thy home
I entered with a thousand portals.

Present to Varuna the gracious giver,
A hymn Vasista, bright and very pleasant,
..... 7.88.

Once more,

O mighty Varuna, now and hereafter, even as of old,
will we speak forth our worship. 2.28.

The heart of the Vedic seer went out to God in love and devotion. He loved singing his praises. He earned for God, his love and friendship. That he felt miserable without God is evident. Hence he longs for an intimate communion and fellowship with him. This is bhakti as he knew it.

The Upanisads developed the ideal of bhakti. We are apt to think of the Upanisads as mere intellectual treatises. But most of the Upanisads as we noted before are the works of mystics of a high intellectual order who had an experience of God in their souls. Hence bhakti is one of the prominent notes of the Upanisads. Only in the Svetasvatara Upanisad, which is the most modern of the twelve ancient Upanisads, the word bhakti occurs.

But the ideal of bhakti appears in almost every Upanisad under the name of upāsana which means intensive devotion to the real Self. We are taught to worship the Self, to contemplate on the Self as a dear object, as the Self is nearer and dearer than all other objects. "Dearer than son, dearer than riches, dearer than any other thing, because this Self is nearer than all... One should worship the Self alone as dear. Of him who worships the Self alone as dear, the dear thing never perishes." Bñh.1.4.8 Husband, wife, child, family, caste or race, all these are dear to us for the sake of the Self. This is very impressively taught by Yājnavalkya to Maitreyi. "Behold, you are dear to me already, and now you say what is dear..... Behold not for the sake of the husband is the husband dear, but for the sake of the Self is the husband dear..... Behold the Self is to be seen, heard, thought upon, and contemplated. O Maitregi, by seeing, hearing, thinking on and contemplating the Self is all this truly known. Bñh. 2.4.4.

The Taittiriya and the Chāndogya Upanisads go further. According to the Taittiriya the object of bhakti lives in the heart. "That which is self-made(self-existent) is verily joy. Who could breathe, who could live, if this blissful One did not exist? It is this who gives happiness. It is only when the creature gains an immovable footing on this invisible, incorporeal, inscrutable and self-supported One that he becomes fearless."

The Chāndogya Upanisad says, "The Infinite is bliss. There is no bliss in the finite. The Infinite alone is bliss." This infinite is the Self. "The Self alone is bely.....One who thinks

thus, sees, thus, and understands thus, loves the Self, revels in the Self, enjoys the company of the Self, and rejoices in the Self, he becomes svarat, self-ruled, he becomes independent of all the worlds."

^{The} Upaniṣads, no doubt, ~~are~~ an advance over the polytheistic religion of the Vedas. But ~~they~~ certainly did lose some of the essentials of bhakti. The human heart does not always feel satisfied with the Infinite or Self which in the main is abstract or impersonal. The Upaniṣadic seers desiring to glorify God stripped him of his personal attributes. But in our definition of bhakti we saw that the Infinite is invariably considered as a perfect person. The Upaniṣads lost sight of this fact. The idea of a Brahman who is in the main impersonal, while satisfying the intellect did not meet the longings of the heart. In the words of MacNicol, "The stuff was too stubborn for religious consciousness; it cannot mould near enough to the heart's desire!" ^{Indian} Bhakti satisfies the head as well as the heart. The love of the Lord is with one's whole being with the heart, mind, soul and strength.

This defect of the Upaniṣads is seen also in early Buddhism. What corresponds to bhakti in Buddhism is dhyāna. It is the highest contemplation or meditation. Its result is samādhi or absolute tranquility. Dhyāna is a conscious effort to bring the mind in harmony with all that is. It tries to eliminate the ego and to be emersed in truth. Dhyāna leads on to real truth. It has four stages. 1. Gladness and joy arising from a life of solitude accompanied by insight reflection and contemplation. 2. Elation, inner calm, great peace. 3. Complete absence of passions and prejudices. 4. Self possession and complete

tranquility. But Buddhism does not supply us with any ^{concrete} object of dhyāna. We are asked to cherish the moods of and contemplate on loving-kindness(maitri), compassion(karuna), cheerfulness(mudita), and impartiality(upeksa). Fourty subjects of meditation are given. Dhyāna is the means of self-development with out an external object. How far this ideal was satisfactory may be seen from the later history of Buddhism.

The ordinary human heart and mind cannot rest satisfied with out an object of bhakti or dyāna external to it and at the same time personal. It is only a very few, if any, that can be devoted to an abstract Infinite, and realise that 'He who is Brahman in the sun is the Ātman in the soul.'

The Gītā ^{like} the later Buddhism tried to supply the missing link. It understood the fact that real bhakti can be given only to a personal God who is near and dear. The Gītā seems to have completed the ideal of bhakti in Hindooism. It has set up an ideal of bhakti -- a personal God, a God-man, Kṛṣṇa who is the final avatāra of Viṣṇu and at the same time the eternal, infinite Brahman of the Upanisads

It is here that the Gītā comes very close to the Fourth Gospel. The latter like the Gītā is an expression of the completion and consummation of the Hebrew devotion to God in the person of Jesus Christ.

Devotion to one God is the key-note of the Hebrew religion. "Thou shalt have no other gods before me," is the first commandment. All the prophets demanded from the people devotion to this one and only God. ~~All~~ Their calamity and punishment are come to them because they forgot their devotion to him. This Hebrew devotion was mainly of an ethical character.

The height of ancient Hebrew devotion is to be found in the Psalms. The Psalms are an expression of love, faith, loyalty, and devotion of the pious Hebrews who rejoiced in the presence of God and in their fellowship with him. "How amiable are thy tabernacles, O ^Yahweh of hosts! My soul longeth, yea, even fainteth for the courts of ^Yahweh; my heart and flesh cry out unto the living God....Blessed are they that dwell in thy house. They will still be praising thee. " 84:1.

The Fourth Gospel is primarily a Hebrew book with a Hebrew devotional background. The writer is one who has given his full devotion to Jesus, the incarnate Son of God. The devotion of the writer is seen throughout the book. It is generally expressed by the term "belief". The believer of the Fourth Gospel is the bhakta. The believer is one who believes, loves, obeys the Lord, who has surrendered his will to the Lord, who is in constant communion with him, and hence one who shares his life and spirit. The purpose of the Gospel is to induce people to believe on Jesus. "These are written that ye might believe" that ye might become the devotees of the Son of God.

The purpose of the Synoptics too is the same; but only in a less pronounced way. "Take my yoke upon you, and learn of me, for I am meek and lowly of heart, and ye shall find rest unto your souls," is calling for devotion to Jesus. Trust, faith, love, inward self-surrender, humility all these are demanded in the Synoptics from the followers of Jesus. But these are attitudes that one takes in his devotion to God primarily.

Paul went a step further. For him Christ was everything. The terms God, Lord, Christ were almost ^{always} interchangable. God offered himself to men through Christ; hence devotion to

Christ meant devotion to God. Paul was a true bhakta of Jesus. The term he uses to express his bhakti is 'faith', which means faith in Jesus who is the full revelation of God.

The writer of the Fourth Gospel closely followed Paul.

Johannine 'belief' is in almost every respect equal to Pauline 'faith', except that there is more of the dogmatic element in the former.

Here, we are concerned with the similarity of Johannine belief with the bhakti ideal of the Gita. Belief in the Son of God is all-important in the Fourth Gospel. Johannine belief has almost all the same elements as the bhakti of the Gita. Like bhakti, it is faith and trust in the eternal and infinite Son of God and an unbreakable bond of love to his person. Through belief, the believer not only comes in contact with this person, but also holds constant communion and fellowship with him. The believer shares the life of Christ. There is a great unity between the believer and Jesus. The believer after having seen his own worthlessness consecrates his whole life to Jesus and gives his full devotion to him. The power of the life of Christ comes into his life through the act of belief. The eternal life is only for the believer.

^{The} Believer begins his life perhaps with an emotional attachment. But it does not stop there. It leads on to knowledge and obedience as bhakti leads to jñāna and karma. Though knowledge sometimes precedes belief in the Gospel, full knowledge comes only to the believer. Likewise, though belief is ethically conditioned, it is the believer that does the will of the Lord perfectly.

Considering the great significance of these words "belief" and "believer" in the Fourth Gospel, it looks as if they are not broad enough terms to convey all that the writer has in mind when he

uses them. Therefore we may be permitted to use bhakti and bhakta instead.

We shall now examine in detail the expression of bhakti in the two books. Both of them consider Bhakti as all-important in their relation to ^{the} Bhagavān (Lord).

The easiest approach to Bhagavān is through bhakti. "He who constantly thinketh upon me, not thinking ever of another, of him I am easily reached." 3:14. "Having shown the highest devotion for me without doubt he shall come to me." 18:68. Compare with this the incident recorded in the 12th chapter of the Fourth Gospel. Jesus readily accepts the devotion of Mary, and it is by such simple devotion that she approached Jesus.

Bhakti means exclusive devotion to the one Bhagavān without a second. "He who serveth me exclusively by the yoga of devotion" B.G.14:26. "Unflinching devotion to me by yoga without other objects," 13:11. "With mind wandering not, after aught else," 8:8. "He, the highest spirit.... may be reached by unswerving devotion to him alone." 8:22. "Worship me alone thinking of no other." 9:22 Jesus tells the Jews that they will not go to him that they might have life.5:40. "He that cometh to me shall never hunger.. and he that believeth on me shall never thirst" 5:35. "If any man thirst let him come unto me." 7:37. "He that believeth on me." 7:38. "Ye would love me." 8:42. "If any man serve me let him follow me." 12:26. Exclusive devotion to the person of Jesus is demanded.

Bhakti to the Bhagavān means bhakti to the Infinite God, because the Infinite God is embodied in the Bhagavān. "Know me, O Partha, as the eternal seed of all beings. I am the reason of the reason endowed....7:10. "Having known me as the mighty ruler of all worlds, and the lover of all beings, he goeth to peace. 5:29

Jesus says, "He that believeth on me, believeth not on me, but on him that sent me." 12:44. "Believest thou not that I am in the Father and the Father in me?" 14:10.

There is a mystical union between the bhakta and the Bhagavān. The bhakta abides in the Bhagavān and the Bhagavān in the bhakta. This mystical union is effected in different ways by the Gita and the Fourth Gospel. But they both agree that the Bhakta has to first abide in the teachings of the Bhagavān and the words of the Bhagavān abide in the bhakta. "Who abide ever in this teaching of mine full of faith.." 3:31. "My words abide in you." F.G.15:7. In the Gītā the bhakta abides in the Bhagavān by constantly placing his mind on him, 12:8, by constant practice of the yoga of contemplation, by thinking of the Bhagavān always without thinking of any other 18:14. It is this yogi, that abides in the Bhagavān with his inner self, 6:47. 6:15. 7:12, that entereth into the being of the Bhagavān 8:5. 9:29. The Fourth Gospel emphasises the mystical union greatly. "If ye abide in me." 15:7. "If a man abide not in me he is cast forth..." 15:6. "Ye shall abide in my love." 15:10. "Ye in me." 14:20 "We will come unto him and make our abode with him." 14:23. "I in you...I in them." 14:20. 17:23. This mystical union is effected in the ^{letting} Fourth Gospel not only by the Lord's words abide in the bhakta but also by the sacramental rite of 'eating the flesh and drinking the blood of the Son of Man.' 5:53. "If any man eat of this bread he shall live for ever." 5:51. The union is still deeper. It is a union like the union of the vine and its branches. It is permanent, continuous. There is an uninterrupted flow of the life of Jesus into the life of the believer. The bhakta assimilates the life of the Bhagavān and they are one.

The fact of the union between the bhakta and the Bhagavān does not do away with the individuality of the bhakta. They are two separate individuals. There is great friendship between them. The Gītā says, "As a friend with friend, as a lover with the beloved," 11:44. "I will declare unto thee who art beloved." 10:1. "Beloved art thou of me." 18:64. "In the fondness of my love." 11:41. "My devotee is dear to me." 12:14. Jesus tells the disciples, "Ye are my friends." 15:14. "Greater love hath no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friends." 15:13. "I have called you friends." 15:15.

The secrets of the Bhagavān are revealed only to the bhakta. The full nature of Kṛṣṇa and his omnipotent form are revealed only to Arjuna. "By devotion to me alone, I may thus be perceived and known and seen in essence." 11:54. Jesus says to the disciples "All things I have heard of my Father I have made known unto you." 15:15. "I will love him, and manifest myself unto him." 14:21.

It is through bhakti that men pass from darkness to light, from death to immortal life. "Liberated from birth and death, old age and sorrow, he drinketh the amrita or the nectar of immortality." 14:20. "These I speedily lift up from the ocean of death and existence... their minds being fixed on me." 12:7. Jesus says to the Jews, "He that heareth my word and believeth on him that sent me, hath everlasting life, and shall not come into condemnation; but is passed from death unto life." 5:24. ~~W~~hoever liveth and believeth on me shall never die." 11:26. "He that believeth, though he were dead, yet shall live." 11:25. "I am come a light into the world, that whosoever believeth on me should not abide in darkness." 12:46.

The bhaktas are liberated from sin. "Come unto me alone for

shelter, sorrow not, I will liberate thee from all sins." 18:66. "He who knoweth me, he among mortals without delusion, is liberated from all sin." 10:3. "Whosoever committeth sin is a servant of sin...If the Son shall, therefore, make you free ye shall be free indeed". 10:34,36. "Ye shall know the truth and the truth shall make you free." 10:32.

The bhakta attains to great peace and full security in life. "By his grace thou shalt obtain supreme peace." 18:62. "To those men who worship me alone thinking of no other I bring full security." 9:22. "Peace I leave with you my peace I give unto you. Not as the world giveth give I unto you. Let not your heart be troubled, neither let it be afraid." 14:27.

The field of work for the bhakta and the Bhagavān is the same. Kṛṣṇa and Arjuna work on the same field side by side. Arjuna does that which Kṛṣṇa asks him to do, and Kṛṣṇa himself does it. Jesus says to his disciples, "Verily, verily, I say unto you, he that believeth on me, the works that I do shall he do also. And greater works than these shall he do." 14:12.

The Bhagavān does everything that the bhakta asks for. At the request of Arjuna all the great spiritual teachings are given to him by Kṛṣṇa. At Arjuna's request Kṛṣṇa shows himself in his true form. Jesus gives the promise, "If ye shall ask anything in my name I shall do it. Whatsoever ye shall ask in my name that will I do." 14:14,15.

Even the most sinful attain righteousness by means of bhakti. "Even if the most sinful worship me, with undivided heart, he too must be accounted righteous." 9:30. Jesus always condemns the self-righteous Pharisees, and befriends the sinners. The instance of Mary may again be quoted.

It is the bhakta that gains the full knowledge of God. "I will declare to thee(my devotee) this knowledge and wisdom in its completness, which having known, there is nothing more here needeth to be known." 7:2. Arjuna at the end of the dialogue says,"I have gained knowledge through thy grace....I am firm, my doubts have fled away." 18:73. "From henceforth ye know Him." 14:7. "They have known that all things are of thee." 17:7. "They have known surely that I come out from thee." 17:8.

Bhakti issues forth in action according to the Bhagavān's will. All actions of the bhakta are done as service to the Bhagavān. The last words of Arjuna are, "I will do according to thy word." 18:73. "If ye love me keep my commandments." 14:15 "Ye are my friends, if ye do whatsoever I command you." 15:14.

The reward of the bhakta is eternal life -- full life in the Bhagavān. "He who serveth me exclusively by the yoga of devotion, he, crossing beyond qualities, he is fit to become the Eternal. Or I am the abode of the Eternal, and of the indestructible nectar of immortality, of immemorial righteousness, and of unending bliss." 14:26,27. "Verily, verily, I say unto you, he that heareth my word, and believeth on him that sent me hath everlasting life." 5:24. "Every one which seeth the Son and believeth on him may have everlasting life." 3:40. "That they also may be one in us," The bhaktas' supreme reward is the ultimate and eternal union with the Bhagavān.

Thus, we see that both writers consider bhakti as the best way of reaching the goal -- the Bhagavān. Neither knowledge nor action is denied; on the other hand they actually follow bhakti. Be a bhakta. You will know Him and do His will.

So far, we have tried to bring out the similarity of the bhakti ideal in the two books. Before we close the chapter it would be well to note at least one striking difference. It is to be found neither in bhakti nor in the bhakta but in the Bhagavān.

To the writer of the Fourth Gospel, Jesus has the supreme value because of his actual life. It is his life and personality that made him attach himself to Jesus as his bhakta. In the excellence of his living, moral and spiritual personality the bhaktas could find God. The writer knew Jesus as an actual person that lived and died for him. The cry from Peter, "Lord to whom else shall we go. Thou has the words of eternal life," came as the result of the impression produced by the power of of the actual earthly life of Jesus. (See Chapter 3.)

But he is not only a teacher, master, and Lord. There is something more in Jesus than his ideal and teaching. He is a 'shepherd that laid down his life for the sheep, and took it up again.' In the death, resurrection, and glorification of Jesus, the writer of the Fourth Gospel finds great value and singnificance for the life of the bnakta. Jesus has not ceased to exist. He is a living personality, and he has become the mediator between God and man once and for all times. He does not need to be 'born from age to age for establishing righteousness.' The bhaktas can enter into permanent fellowship with him and share his life, and that is the force for righteousness. The life of the Bhagavān constantly flows into the life of the bhakta, as the life-giving sap flows from the vine to the branches, so that the bhakta says, "I live, and yet not I, but Christ liveth in me."

Chapter 6.

Jñāna Mārga -- The Way of Intuitive Knowledge.

We saw in the last chapter that bhakti leads to the knowledge of God. In the Gītā such knowledge is called jñāna, which may be translated as intuitive knowledge. In this chapter we shall consider this important element of the Gītā -- the Jñāna Mārga.

First of all we must understand the term jñāna. Like bhakti jñāna is a difficult term to translate. It corresponds to *νόος* of the Greek thinkers or *prajña* of Buddhism. All the three terms mean a mystical or intuitive knowledge as differentiated from intellectual knowledge which is known as *vijñāna* in Sanskrit or *διάνοια* or *γνῶσις* (in the classical sense) in Greek.

Jñāna as well as *vijñāna* are found in the Gītā. They have much in common; but they are not the same. Jñāna as well as *vijñāna* are knowledge, we might even say knowledge of God. But their starting points, the process and the results are different. *Vijñāna* starts from consciousness (*manas*). Jñāna has its roots in bhakti which is ^{at-tink} mainly an emotional attachment to God. Though it is the highest activity of the human mind and the best form of human insight, it starts with the devotion of the heart. It needs first regeneration of the heart, whereas *vijñāna* requires developing of the power of investigation. According to Buddhism also it is the unregenerate that cultivate *vijñāna* while the regenerate develop *prajña*. The one is cognition and the other is true insight. They are not entirely independent; but it is only the latter that leads to true enlightenment or *bodhi*. Thus Gotama Buddha says, "I have been alone, Ānanda, in rapture of thought..."

till I rose above perception of the world without into the infinite sphere of cognition, and this again melted into nothing. Insight(prajña) came, and I discerned with the celestial vision the way of the world, the tendencies of men, and their coming to be, past, present and yet to come."

The prajña of Buddhism is closely related to dhyāna. It comes as a result of dhyāna and samādhi which heighten the powers of the mind. Without dhyāna and samādhi it is impossible to obtain the highest insight - prajña.

So also in the Gītā, jñāna is closely associated with bhakti. It comes as a result of unswerving devotion to the highest and the noblest. What hides God from us is not intellectual error, but lack of devotion.

The object of vijñana is to find the One behind the many, the causal principle of the universe, the ultimate reality. It is an intellectual interest. It is a process of investigation, an affair of the intellect almost detached from the heart and the will. Jñāna on the other hand is not a mere intellectual process. It is spiritual insight, almost a revelation of the ultimate reality. Jñāna mārga is not a mārga of finding God through discussion and argument. It is open only to those who give unfaltering bhakti. Through bhakti we become one with the divine. The divine takes possession of us and we see and know. We come to see things that we could not see before because we are given 'divine eyes'. We gain intuitive or mystical knowledge of God.

Purification of mind, body and senses, concentration and meditation, sraddha or faith are also pre-requisites of jñāna. Subdue all kinds of undesirable impulses and hold fast to bhakti to God. Then comes a knowledge quite different from a knowledge

of him through *vijñāna*. The knowledge of the seer is different from the knowledge of the philosopher. The one is mystical and the other is intellectual. One is practical and the other is theoretical. One starts with a humble quiet prayer, a desire for the vision of God, a longing for his love and friendship, goes on to an intimate sense of union with him and a clear knowledge about him. The other starts with an intellectual search for the Infinite, goes on with it and ever remains coldly intellectual. The conclusion that *jñāna* comes to is *tat tvam asi* and that of *vijñāna* is *neti neti*. *Jñāni* becomes one with God's being. He has not only a clear knowledge of God, but also has union with him which brings an excessive joy and delight. He cannot describe his knowledge because it is mystical. It is indescribable even 'as the taste of a dumb person.' Here He gains a vision that his personality as well as the personalities of all human beings are partial expressions of the divine personality. Each individual is the eternal spirit manifesting itself in time and space.

Thus the highest *bhakti* has attained its object, the *jñāna* of the Eternal God. The writer of the Fourth Gospel expresses the same thing when he says, "This is life eternal, that they might know thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent." 17:3.

Bhakti and *jñāna* are thus inseparable. *Bhakti* is devotion that is endless and it leads to *jñāna* that is unlimited. True spiritual vision is gained through *bhakti* and *jñāna*. When the heart is at work the mind does not take a holiday. We may summarize the whole discussion in the words of a sixth century writer "By love he may be gotten and holden by thought; and understanding never."

Jñāna is related to karma as well. (For fuller discussion see Chapter 7.) Since jñāna is not mere intellectualism it affects our will and actions and shapes our character and personality.

The Gītā emphasises jñāna mārga as the way of reaching the goal though it does not ignore vijñāna altogether. The ultimate reality is to be known, ^{not} by mere intellectual speculation, but by jñāna, mystical knowledge and experience of God in the Antar Ātman -- the Inner Self.

The author is following the example of the earlier seers who composed the Upanisads. As we saw before, the Upanisads are not mere intellectual treatises. On the contrary, they are expressions of a desperate and often successful attempts to find God in one's own soul. Vijñāna is not ignored; but it is made subservient to jñāna. The experience is mystical though the search is rigorously intellectual. Jñāna is gained not by vijñāna but by upāsana. After jñāna has been obtained, vijñāna is made use of to formulate a theory of the ultimate reality. Theology comes only after the experience of God and as a result of it. The object of the Upanisadic seers was mystical union with Brahma. He who really knows that he is Brahma has obtained the highest jñāna.

"Verily, that great, unborn soul.....is Brahma....
He who knows this becomes the fearless Brahma." Bṛ.4.4.25.
"This is the soul of mine within the heart, this is Brahma."
Chand.3:14:4. "He, verily, who knows that supreme Brahma, becomes the very Brahma." Mund.3.2.9.

In the highest Golden Sheath,
Is Brahma, without stain.....
.....
That which the knowers of the Ātman do know. Mund.2.2.9.

The Ātman which pervades all things,

 Which is rooted in self-knowledge...
 This is Brahma, the highest mystic teaching.
 'vet. 2.5.16.

In the ~~se~~ above passages we might detect a combination of jñāna and vijñāna. Through upāsana the seers gained a mystical knowledge of God. Vijñāna came in afterwards to formulate, systematize and to philosophize. Yet the end and aim of the seer is a mystical experience and knowledge of God. Therefore overlooking everything else in life, he strives towards that goal. The Śvetāśvatara Upanisad is a record of such experience and knowledge.

By knowing as kindly him who is hidden in all things,
 The embracer of the universe....
 By knowing God, one is released from fetters.
 They who know That become the immortal..

They who thus know him with the heart and mind
 As abiding in heart become immortal.
 Svet. 4.12.20.

Him let us know as the adorable God, the Lord of the
 world.

Jñāna mārga is not overlooked by any great religion. The Psalmist who sings in bhakti, "O God thou art my God, early will I seek thee; my soul thirsteth for thee", 63.1. also says, "They that ~~say~~ know thy name will put their trust in thee." 9.10. "Be still and know that I am God." 46.10. "My mouth shall speak of wisdom, and the meditation of my heart shall be understanding." 49.3. It is the fool that says in his heart that there is no God. 14.1. The old Hebrews did not make much distinction between the heart and mind. The proverbs also emphasise the need of knowledge of God. 5.1-2.

The appeal of the prophets to Israel is mainly an appeal

for a renewal of their heart-devotion to Yaweh. Yet the prophetic religion has by no means the weakness of emotionalism. The prophets understand the place of jñāna in the religious life of their people. Isaiah says, "Wisdom and knowledge shall be the stability of thy times, and strength of salvation." 33.6. Jeremiah says, "I will give them a heart to know me." 24.7. Hosea says, "Thou shalt know no God but me." 13.4. "Thou shalt know the Lord." 2.20.

In Christianity the emphasis is no less on jñāna than it is in Hindooism or Judaism. Christianity repudiates intellectualism, but not the intellect. It repudiates rationalism, but not reason. It repudiates emotionalism, but not emotion. It rightly appeals to the heart first. A regeneration of the heart is required in order to have a vision of God. Heart-devotion is necessary to begin with. But it does not belittle the function of jñāna. Jesus' summary of the commandments is that we should love the Lord not only with the heart, soul and strength, but with our minds as well. Most of the parables of Jesus are not mere appeal to the heart. They have something in them to stimulate the mind. That he was not primarily a teacher of intellectual truths is self-evident. Yet throughout his teachings he lays emphasis on the need of a right knowledge of God. He asks men to purify their minds, their motives so that they might know God.

Paul disparages the wisdom of this world. Yet he does not by any means preach a mere emotional religion. He asks the Corinthians to "abound in everything, in faith, utterance and knowledge." 2 Cor. 8:7. "Though I be rude in speech, yet not in knowledge." 11.6. "Be not children in understanding." 1 Cor. 14.20. Paul's 'faith' leads him to a mystical knowledge of God.

Knowledge finds its best expression in the Fourth Gospel as jñāna finds its best expression in the Gītā. The writer of the Fourth Gospel means by knowledge what the Gītā means by jñāna. Neither of them has set forth jñāna as a second mārga. They both lay greater emphasis on bhakti, because only through bhakti that jñāna could be obtained.

The Gītā holds that if one attaches oneself to the Bhagavān in bhakti, with manas clinging unto him, the jñāna of the Bhagavān is inevitable. His doubts vanish. He is no more sceptical and no more perplexed. 8.27. His delusion becomes destroyed because he has gained jñāna through the grace of the Bhagavān. 18:73. When jñāna is obtained 'knowledge and wisdom in its completeness' is obtained, and 'there is nothing more here needeth to be known.' 7.2. Such knowledge is superior to action. 3.1. ¹Jñāni is not bound by actions. 4.14b. He who obtains jñāna is liberated from all sin. 10.3. Full freedom comes to him. 4.32c. He is liberated from all evil. 9.1. There is no purifier in this world like jñāna. 4.38a. Even sinners 'cross over all sin by the raft of jñāna.' 4.36. It is the deluded men of this world that do not obtain jñāna. 7.25. They fall because they do not know the Bhagavān in essence. 9.24. The way to peace is jñāna. 5.24. The Bhagavān becomes very dear to jñāni. 7.17. Above all, knowing the Bhagavān is eternal life, because thus knowing him the bhakta enters into his being. 4.9. The men who know the Eternal go to the Eternal. 8.24.

Thus we see that the jñāna of the Gītā is a higher activity of the mind than vijñāna. It is a first hand experiential, mystic and intuitive knowledge of God which is considered in itself

sometimes, as eternal salvation. The knowledge of God is primarily moral and spiritual and not intellectual. In this conception of Jñāna we saw the debt of the Gītā to earlier thinkers.

In the Fourth Gospel conception of knowledge we can detect a double influence at work. On the one hand there was the Hebrew, the Synoptic and the Pauline influences and on the other the Greek, more especially the Gnostic influence. The latter of these we shall consider later.

We have already considered the Hebrew, the Synoptic and the Pauline view of the knowledge. To them knowledge was not a mere intellectual activity. Real knowledge meant a knowledge of God. Hence it is moral and spiritual. It is intuitive and experiential. It comes as a result of bhakti to God and enters into a perfect with harmony ^{with} of his will and purpose.

That this conception is primary in the mind of the Fourth Gospel writer is evident from an examination of some of the passages. The words of Jesus to the unbelieving Jews are, "Ye neither know me nor my Father. If ye had known me, ye should have known my Father also." 8.19. "Ye have not known him, but I know him, and if I should say, I know him not, I shall be a liar like unto you; but I know him and keep his saying." 8.55. "He that sent me is true whom ye know not." 7:28. In another connection he says to his own disciples, "If ye had known me, ye should have known my Father also. From henceforth ye know him and have seen him." 14.7. "O righteous Father the world hath not known thee; but I have known thee." 17.25. It is knowledge that brings liberation. "Ye shall know the truth and the truth shall make you free." 8.32. The knowledge of God is eternal life. "This is life eternal, to know thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ

whom thou hast sent." 17.3.

Thus it is clear that the Gītā as well as the Gospel consider jñāna as primarily spiritual - a knowledge of God obtained through bhakti. In a sense it is eternal life itself, for both.

But neither of them consider jñāna as merely spiritual. Vijñāna has a place in both books though it is made subservient to jñāna. The writers did not want to leave jñāna as purely spiritual as detached from the intellectual. They interpreted jñāna in terms of philosophy and of metaphysics.

We have already seen in Chapter 1 (pages 18-27) how the spiritual experience and knowledge of God in the Gītā has been interpreted in terms of various philosophical and metaphysical systems, and hence it need not be repeated here. Therefore we shall consider this here in connection with the Fourth Gospel.

The writer of the Fourth Gospel owes much to the Greek, especially to the Gnostic systems of thought. He avoids the term *γνῶσης* probably because he did not want his readers to understand that he borrowed anything from the Gnostics. Moreover the term did not fully express his idea of knowledge.

However, he is writing to those who are acquainted with Greek and Gnostic philosophy and hence he could not ignore their conception of knowledge. He is writing in the language of his own time and culture. He is trying to interpret his spiritual vision of God in their way of thinking. Therefore he combines the Hebrew, the Synoptics and the Pauline knowledge of God with the intellectual knowledge of the Greek mind. Such combining process may be seen in a number of passages, especially in the memorable words, "This is life eternal, to know thee, the only

true God and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent." These words must be explained in the light of the Greek conception of knowledge. Perfect realisation of life, according to Plato, is when the soul gets out of the trammels of the senses and attain to the undisturbed contemplation of the ideal truth. Life is conditioned by knowledge. Philo gives expression to almost the same idea in his conception of the Logos. As a man advances in true knowledge he realises more and more fully the logos principle in him and thus enters more and more into the divine life.

"Ye shall know the truth and the truth shall make you free," 8.32 suggests the Greek idea of knowledge as a means of deliverence, its relation to truth, and the freedom it brings. "But ye know him; for he dwelleth with you and shall be in you," 14.17, indicates the Greek idea of the Logos indwelling in every man. A few of the other passages that show a Greek influence are the following:- Jesus tells the Samaritan woman, "Ye worship ye know not what; we worship that which we know." 4.22. "If thou knowest the gift of God." 4.10. The disciples tell Jesus, "We know not whither thou goest, and how can we know the way?" 14.5. "If ye know these things happy....." 13.17. It is thus that the writer of the Fourth Gospel, like the writer of the Gita, interprets *jñāna* in terms of *vijñāna* or tries to combine them.

There is one more point of resemblance that is very important. Hitherto we considered *jñāna* as an outcome of bhakti. But there is also a bhakti of richer and fuller content that follows *jñāna* and as a direct result of it. It is **very** different from the simple bhakti with which the life of the bhakta started. It is the bhakta and no other that becomes the *jñāni*. The more he is

devoted the more he knows. The more he knows, the more he is devoted. Bhakti is no more of the heart alone. It is of the heart as well as of the mind. "The jñāni adores the Bhagavān in wrapt emotion, 10.8, with manas and reason dedicated to him, 12.14. The māhātmās having known the Bhagavān worship him with unswerving mind. 9.13. "Those who with manas fixed on me ever harmonised worship me with faith supreme endowed." 12.2. "He who undeluded knoweth me thus as the supreme spirit, he, all-knowing, worshippeth me with his whole being." 15.19.

We find the same kind of relation between jñāna and bhakti in the Fourth Gospel. There is a bhakti that preceeds jñāna which is a simple child-like trust and there is a bhakti that is fuller and richer which follows jnana. "Believe the works that ye may know and believe." 10.38. The first is a simple belief and the second comes as a consequence of jñāna. As examples of the first kind of belief we might quote such passages as, "Woman believe me," 4.21. "Doest thou believe on the sone of God," 9.35; 9.36; 6.29; 4:42; 5.44; 11.15,40,42,48, 20.31. Unlike this, the second kind of belief follows knowledge and often they seem to coincide. "They have known surely that I have come out from thee and have believed that thou didst send me." 17.8. "That ye may know and believe that the Father is in me and I in him." 10.38. In these verses belief actually follows knowledge and looks as if the former is as a consequence of the latter. The words of Martha, "I believe that thou art Christ the Son of God," 11.27, (see also 26) is an expression of bhakti that comes as a result of her knowledge of Christ. See also 1.7; 1.12; 3.12; 6.29; 7.5; 7.39; 12.36; 14.1; 14.11; 17.21; 18.75.

Thus for both writers, *jñāna* is the one factor that creates a definite act of *bhakti* which is in every ^{way} fuller than the *bhakti* with which the *bhakta* started his life. *Bhakti* leads to *jñāna* and that in its turn brings a *bhakti* which involves the activity of one's whole being.

This means that neither *bhakti* nor *jñāna* is self-sufficient. Since it involves the activity of the whole being of man it must issue forth in action or karma. "If ye know these things happy are ye if ye do them." 13.17. To this we shall turn our attention next.

Chapter 7.

Karma Mārga -- The Way of Works.

It is a fact of psychology that we cannot separate the heart, the mind and the will. Bhakti, jñāna and karma are bound up together. Lacking any one element one does not attain the goal.

Neither bhakti nor jñāna furnishes us with morality. A man ~~may~~ spend his whole life time in worshipful adoration of and devotion to God or he may know all he can know about him. Yet if he is without a standard of morality his devotion as well as his knowledge become useless. In fact bhakti and jñāna inevitably produce karma. Bhakti means an effort to please God and to do his will. "If ye love me ye will keep my commandments." Jñāna means a knowledge of God as one who is righteous and moral. All the great religions realise with the Psalmist, "The Lord is righteous in all his ways and holy in all his works." 145.17. His primary requirements are to do justly and to love mercy and to walk humbly with him. Mic. 6.8.

Karma mārga is the way of works. The word karma means deed, work or action. It is sometimes used in the sense of sacred work as sacrifice, ablution and certain other religious rites. It has acquired the meaning of fate as well. In the Indian thought it is generally associated with samsāra or the round of existence.

* Like bhakti and jñāna, karma is not a new conception in the Gītā. It is as old as the Vedas themselves. We already noted Rta in connection with the conception of the Eternal Order. This Rta is the starting point of karma as well. Rta is the spiritual principle that pervades the whole universe. All gods and nature

* In the Gītā Karma is Dharma or duty.

obey Rta. Hence men too are bound to obey it. Rta is the universal essence of all things. It supplies the standard of morality.

alone

Varuna/perfectly obeys Rta. He is true, righteous and moral; hence he expect his worshippers to be like him. Some of the great ^{compeers} gods, ^{of} of Varuna, are righteous and moral and hence they demanded righteousness and morality from men. Some of them cannot be turned away from the paths of righteousness at any time by any offering.

"They see through both evil and good...They abhor and punish evil, sustain and support the good." Sorcery, witch-craft, seduction, ^{adultery} and gambling are considered vicious and are denounced.

7.104.8f; 4.5.5. On the other hand virtue is praised. Love of man is enjoined. Ahimsā is the guiding principle of the worshipper. "If we have sinned against the man who loves us, have ever wronged a friend or comrade, have ever done an injury to a neighbour.... or even to a stranger, O Lord free us from the guilt of this trespass." 5.45.7. Kindness and hospitality are considered to be great virtues." 8.6.5; 1.2.6.

Thus in the Rg-Veda karma is acting according to Rta, and violating Rta is sin. But during the Brāhmaṇic period karma did not mean action according to Rta. It meant the sacred work of sacrifice, ritual, ceremony, ablution etc. Everything was subjected to sacrifice. The gods became like men in all respects except that they were mightier and immortal. They eat, drink, quarrel, fight, feast and dance. The best way to please them is to give them a full and hearty meal. The ambition of men was to become immortal like gods and they tried to attain this goal by sacrifice. They could get almost anything by the power of sacrifice. Without it even the sun would not rise. Even Indra could be disposed from his throne by a hundred horse sacrifices. Such was the commercialist

basis of the Brahmanic religion and its ethical contents were almost gone. Rich offering was more efficacious than right living.

One thing that the Brāhmaṇas did was to connect karma definitely with samsāra. "Whatever food a man eats in this world by that ~~food~~ he is eaten in the next world." Sat. Brāh. 12.9.11. "Thus have they done to us in yonder world, so we do to them again in this world." Sat. Brāh. 2.6. This shows that morality is not altogether absent in the Brahmanic period. Good works are enjoined. Truth-speaking is considered essential. There are moral duties to gods as well as to men. Yet on the whole, the period of Brāhmaṇas was a period of 'legalistic code and conventional piety.'

In the Upaniṣads, we see a protest against the sacerdotalism of the Brāhmaṇas. They show clearly that it is not through sacrifices, but through good deeds that men become good. Brh. 3.2.13. The Upaniṣads worked out the law of Karma very effectively. As we sow, so shall we reap. Good deeds are followed by good consequences and evil deeds by evil consequences. "A man is a creature of will. According as he believes in this world, so will he be when he is devoarted." Chānd 3.14.1. See also Brh. 4.4.5. We get free from samsāra by our good deeds. Evil and selfish deeds bind us to samsāra. Though a man is subject to the law of karma, he can master it by the strength of his good deeds.

In the Upaniṣads, a person is admitted to the study of sacred knowledge not on the strength of zeal, but on the basis of moral excellence. Kāṭha 1.2.24-25. Bhakti and jñāna could come only to those who are morally fit and they in turn bear fruit in karma.

The Upaniṣads often present us with a very high morality which is "beyond good and evil." When a man becomes a bhakta and a jñāni, he is above all laws. Kausitaki. 2.8. Brh. 4.4.22.

"Him does not afflict the thought, why have I not done what is good, why have I committed sin." Tait. 2.9. This is the non-moral stage. In cases of doubt as to morality ^{the} Taittiriya advises us to conduct ourselves as the knowers of the Brahman would. 1.2.

Buddhism insists on strict morality. Salvation from evil and suffering consists in undoing our wrong past by our right actions. Buddha insists on purity of motive. Good actions are those that are pure. "Better than sovereignty over the earth, better than going to heaven..... is the reward of the first step to holiness." Dhammapada 178. That which constitutes well-being and leads to nirvāna ^{is} love, compassion, charity, purity of conduct, etc. Without these life is dead at the very beginning.

Buddhist morality is closely related to dhyāna and prajñā. Unselfish desire and conduct are found only in a person that has given ^{himself} to dhyāna and is enlightened by prajñā. At the same time dhyāna and prajñā are conditioned by morality. They are inter-related. We shall find the same kind of inter-relation between bhakti, jñāna and karma in the Gītā also.

But before we consider the way of Karma in the Gita and its relation to the other ways we shall briefly consider its development in ^{the} Judaism and ^{the} early Christian Church.

From the very start the Jewish conception of Yahweh was as a God who demanded righteousness and justice. Such an early story as that of Cain and Abel illustrates the Hebrew idea of Yahweh as one who is pleased with good actions and displeased with evil actions of men. "If thou doest well, shalt thou not be accepted? And if thou doest not well, sin lieth at the door." Gen. 4.7. In the same story the brother's blood cries to God for

justice. The wicked is punished as a consequence of his wickedness. The first and foremost requirement of God is righteousness from his people. Yahweh brings ^{the} flood on earth because of the wickedness of men; but saves Noah the only righteous man of that time. God does not want to hide from Abraham his punishment of the wicked cities, because Abraham is righteous. He will not destroy those cities if there are even ten righteous persons. He does not want to destroy the righteous with the wicked. Gen. 18.23f. "Let me die the death of the righteous," Num. 23.10 is the wish of the pious. "Yahweh is the God of truth . Just and righteous is he." Deut. 32.4. The Psalmist is full of praise for the righteous. "The Lord knoweth the way of the righteous." 1.6. "God judgeth the righteous, he is angry with the wicked." 7.11. "The righteous sheweth mercy and giveth." 37.21. The Proverbs says, "The lips of the righteous feed many, but fools die." 10.21.

The burden of the preaching of the prophets to Israel is that they left the ways of a righteous God and substituted sacrifices for right living. Isaiah says, "To what purpose is the multitude of your sacrifices unto me.....Put away the evil of your doings.....learn to do well.... Seek judgment, relieve the oppressed, judge the fatherless, plead for the widow." 1.11f. Jeremiah says, "The right of the needy they do not judge." 5.28. Ezekiel constantly complains that the people have "used oppression and exercised robbery, and have vexed the poor and the needy: yea, they have oppressed the stranger wrongfully." 22.29. Amos cries that they sold the righteous for silver and the poor for a pair of shoes. 2.6. Micah says, "What doth the Lord require of thee, but to do justly and to love mercy and to walk humbly with thy God. 6.8.

Jesus was one with the prophets in presenting God as a righteous and just God. The fact that he is a kind Father did not do away with his requirement of righteousness from his children. "Blessed are they that hunger and thirst after righteousness." Mat. 5.6. Jesus did not introduce a new righteousness nor a new way of the will. But he taught people to go into the motive of their actions and to purify even the motive so that all their actions might be pure. We need not go here into detail of the Synoptic presentation of Jesus as a great ethical teacher.

Paul who points out the way of salvation through faith insists also on righteousness. "Yield...your members as instruments of righteousness unto God." Rom. 6.13. "Ye became the servants of righteousness." Rom. 6.18. "Awake to righteousness, and sin not." 1Cor. 15.34.

Having thus seen the backgrounds we shall now proceed to examine in detail the way of Karma in the Gītā and the Fourth Gospel.

The Gītā begins with an eloquent address to the will. Arjuna shrinks from his duty. Seeing all his kinsmen on the opposite side he could not make up his mind to fight. Kṛṣṇa reminds him of his duty and asks him to do it regardless of the consequences. "Looking at thine own duty, thou shouldest not tremble." 2.31. Arjuna is confused and he could not understand why Kṛṣṇa should enjoin on him such terrible action. Thereupon Kṛṣṇa gives him a magnificent sermon on duty which has a universal application. He tells Arjuna why a person should act.

By not acting Arjuna is looking for freedom from action. But Kṛṣṇa says that a man does not win freedom from action by

abstaining from activity; nor by renunciation does he attain perfection. 3.4. Moreover, no one can remain actionless even for a moment. It is contrary to his nature. He is driven helplessly to action by his gunas. 3.5. He who does not act, ~~or~~ do what is his duty, acts as a hypocrite. 3.6. A worthy man is he who controls the senses by the mind, and performs action without attachment. 3.7. Again, action for action is superior to inaction, and without action even the maintenance of the body is impossible. 3.8. This whole world is bound by action. 3.9. God (Prajāpati) propagated this world by means of action. 3.10. It is through action that the gods (the shining ones) nourish us, and without action we cannot nourish the shining ones. There must be mutual nourishing of one another. Certainly he is a thief who enjoys all that is given to him and never gives anything in return. 3.11-12. It is through action that all creatures come into being. 3.13. Action comes from the eternal springs of action, the imperishable Brahma. 3.15. It is only the sinful that do not act and their lives are in vain. 3.16. It is really a great dishonour if we do not act and dishonour is worse than death. A man reaches the Supreme by constantly performing action without attachment. 3.19. Men attain perfection by action. 3.20. He who has an eye for the welfare of the world performs action. 3.20. The world always imitates great men who set the standard of action for others. If those few men who are great do not act, the world would imitate them. 3.21. A world where all men do not act is not a good world to live in. God himself acts though action is not forced on him and there is nothing that he has not attained. 3.22. If God did not act himself, men would follow his example and the world's

would go to ruin and he would be author of confusion of castes and the cause of destruction of creatures. 3.23-24. If we not act we might unsettle the mind of the ignorant, because he thinks that action is important. Men of perfect knowledge should not thus unsettle the foolish whose knowledge is imperfect.

3.26,29. Action is in conformity with one's own nature. Every wise man behaves in conformity with his own nature. 3.33.

These are reasons enough why one should act or should do his duty.

The *Gītā* gives advice not only why one should act, but also how one should act. Kṛṣṇa tells Arjuna to act regardless of the consequences, without looking for fruits, without attachment. It is only the ignorant that act from attachment to action. The wise act without attachment. 3.25,28. One should act without egoism, without the thought 'I am the doer.' 3.27. "He who regardeth this (the dweller in the body) as a slayer and he who thinketh he is slain, both of them are ignorant. He slayeth not nor is he slain." 2.29. One should act surrendering all actions to God, with thoughts resting on the supreme self, from hope and egoism freed, and of mental fever cured. 3.30. One should act in harmony with God, 3.26, with a desire for the welfare of the world, 3.25, without unsettling the mind of the ignorant, 3.29, renouncing the fruit which action yieldeth, 2.51, freed from anxiety amid pains, indifferent amid pleasures, loosed from passion fear and anger, 2.56, without attachment on every side, whatever happens either fair or foul, without any likes or dislikes, 2.57, with senses restrained and mastered, and understanding well-poised, 2.61, freed from yearnings, selfless and without egoism, 2.71.

The *Gītā* recognizes impediments to duty. Kṛṣṇa says that desire is a great impediment in doing what is right. Therefore mastering first the senses slay this thing of sin. 3.41. "Affection and aversion for the objects of sense abide in the senses; let none come under the dominion of the two; they are obstructors of the path." 3.34.

The *Gītā* lays down a practical code of ethics, though there is nothing new in it. It insists on righteousness. The purpose of Kṛṣṇa's avatāra is for the protection of the good and for the destruction of the evil-doers, for firmly establishing righteousness. Whenever there is a decay of righteousness and an exaltation of unrighteousness he himself comes forth. 4.7,8.

The *Gītā* advocates simple virtues and condemns vices. Discarding hypocrisy, arrogance, conceit, anger, wrath, harshness, foolishness, insatiable desires, vanity, impure resolves, gratification of sensual desires and enjoyments, lust, materialism etc. 16.4,10,11,12, we are asked to follow the path of fearlessness, cleanliness of life, steadfastness in wisdom, almsgiving, self-restraint, sacrifice, the study of the scriptures, austerity, straight-forwardness, harmlessness, truth, absence of wrath, renunciation, peacefulness, absence of crookedness, compassion to living beings, uncovetousness, mildness, modesty, absence of fickleness, vigour, forgiveness, fortitude, purity, absence of envy and pride, 16.1-3, friendliness, lack of egoism, balance in pleasure and pain, contentment, harmony, self-control, resolution, dedication to God, freedom from the anxieties of joy, anger and fear, 12.13f, humility, unpretentiousness, rectitude, 13.8f and other similar virtues.

Nowhere in the Fourth Gospel do we find the writer laying down a practical code of ethics as the author of the *Gītā* does. He has not given us any sermon on why we should do the will of God and how we should do it. But in the First Epistle of John, which is a kind of appendix to the Fourth Gospel, we find a few hints as to our duty. There, we are asked to purify ourselves as he is pure, 3.4, not to sin, 3.6, not to love the world, 2.15, to make love real, 3.18, to help the brother in need, 3.17, to lay down our lives for others, 2.17, to practice righteousness, 2.29. to obey the will of God and do his commandments, 2.17, to conquer the world, 5.4, and to live as Jesus lived, 2.6.||| The writer has rightly omitted these from the Fourth Gospel itself. There is no necessity of laying down a code of ethics when there is a living example who embodies in himself all ethics and morality. He has shown Jesus to be the embodiment of the Father's will and purpose. He came down to do the will of the Father and did it perfectly. We can look to him and know what our duty is, and why and how we should do it.||| Among other things, the Fourth Gospel is also a protest against a position in the history of early Christianity that the life of Jesus on earth was a mere appearance. The writer has shown it to be actual, that he did not 'come into the world by the power of his *māyā*', 'the power of thought that produces form, which is transient and therefore unreal.' His life being actual, his example is enough to tell any man what the will of God is, what his duty is. Therefore it need not lay down a code of ethics like the *Gītā* away the real person of Kṛṣṇa. which in its Vedantic edition explains... As *Taittirīya Upaniṣad* points out in another connection, in cases of doubt as to duty and morality all that we have to do is to conduct ourselves as

Jesus did. If we want to know what actual love and enthusiasm for humanity is, we need to look only to the cross. "Greater love hath no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friends." 15.13. If we need an example of humility and service look at him washing the disciples' feet. 13.1-18. If we need to know what sympathy and tender-heartedness is, see him at the tomb of Lazarus. 11. He is the embodiment of all virtues, of love, service, sacrifice, humility etc that we have almost exhaustively enumerated in connection with the Gita. What the writer wants to tell us is that Jesus sought to communicate to men the secret of this his own moral and spiritual personality. If that secret is grasped all moral and ethical codes become unnecessary. To possess the same will, the same spirit of love, goodness and holiness as he possessed, by fellowship and communion with him and trustful obedience to him is certainly knowing and doing one's duty.

This brings us to the point of relation of duty(karma) to bhakti and jñāna. Duty is obedience to, and action according to the will of God. It precedes as well as follows bhakti and jñāna. This is as true in the Fourth Gospel as it is in the Gītā.

The Gītā starts with duty. The first section is devoted mainly to Karma mārga. It is only when Arjuna is willing to 'surrender all actions' (3.30) to Kṛṣṇa that he gets into the attitude of bhakti and obtains jñāna. The primary address of Kṛṣṇa is to the will. "Therefore, without attachment, constantly perform action which is duty, for, by performing action without attachment, man verily reacheth the Supreme." 3.19. "Jānaka and others indeed attained perfection by action." 3.20.

Before a man can become a bhakta or a jñāni he should act according to the best of his moral light.

This is brought out very clearly in the Fourth Gospel also. In several places the way of the will takes precedence of the way of belief and the way of knowledge. Belief and knowledge come from a regular habit of moral obedience. The Jews were prevented from accepting Jesus because they were ethically unprepared. Jesus says to the Jews, "If any man do his will, he shall know of the doctrine, whether it be of God, or whether I speak of myself." "Why do ye not understand my speech? Even because ye cannot hear my word. Ye are of your father the devil and the lusts of your father ye will do." 8.43-44. "How can ye believe, who receive honour of another, and seek not the honour that cometh from the only God." 5.44. "For every one that doeth evil hateth the light, neither cometh to the light.... He that doeth the truth cometh to the light...." 3.20-21. The demand from Nicodemus is that he shall be born again that he may believe and know the things of God. A moral and ethical character is necessary before one could become a bhakta and a jñāni. But the karma that follows bhakti and jñāna is different from this karma that precedes them.

The Gītā starts with Karma and ends also with karma. "I will do according to thy word," are the last words of Arjuna. This determination to do the will of the Bhagavān is as a consequence of his bhakti and jñāna. Bhakti produces action. He who loves God and is devoted to him does his will. Since he becomes one with God's being he acts as God would act. He is an instrument of God to accomplish his will and purpose in this world. Kṛṣṇa uses Arjuna to put down the evil reign of his cousins. "Perform action, O Dhananjaya, dwelling in union with the divine."

Duty is done by "placing all actions in the Eternal." 5.10. Such doing of duty is worship of God. 18.46. Karma comes as a natural fruit of bhakti and also of *jñāna*. They are an indispensable necessity for right action. If men are without them they act wrong. 3.22. It is the *jñāna* that acts in conformity with his own nature. 3.33. Though he acts he is not bound by actions nor by their fruits. 4. 14. He acts seeing inaction in action and action in inaction. 4.18. He works free from all desire. 4.19. He hopes for nothing, his mind and self are controlled, abandons greed. 4.21.

The bhakta or *jñāni* who thus acts transcends the ordinary rules of morality. He is not bound by external laws. He acts in such a way as to appear a violation of the ordinary rules of morality. Killing and non-killing are alike to him. "He who is free from egoistic notions.....though he slay the people, he slayeth not nor is bound." 18.17. He is unaffected as a lotus leaf by water. He has reached the non-moral state. Freed souls have no rules to obey. They do what they please. They are beyond what we consider good and evil.

The Fourth Gospel clearly shows that belief and knowledge bear fruit in work. Work is an outcome of devotion to and knowledge of God who is ever working himself for the good of his children. The man who becomes one with Christ cannot help working with him even as he works. "If ye love me, ye will keep my commandments." 14.15. This is the commandment that they love one another as he loved them. 15.12. "These things I command you that ye love one another." 15.17. All actions are summed up in love. Love bears fruit in action. Fruit-bearing comes as a result of the union of the bhakta with Christ. "As the branch cannot

bear fruit of itself, except it abide in the vine; no more can ye except ye abide in me." 15.4. "He that believeth on me, the works that I do shall he do also." 14.12. Likewise knowledge also bears fruit in work. "If ye know these things, happy are ye if ye do them." 13.17. Real knowledge of Christ means sharing his activities.

The bhakta or the *jñāni* pours himself out in unselfish service, not because of outward constraint or external law, but because his soul delights to share everything with Christ. No ordinary rules of morality could bind him. He is above all laws, and is a law unto himself. Kant states the truth of this fact clearly in his metaphysics of morals. "A perfectly good will would therefore be equally subject to objective laws (viz., laws of good), but could not be conceived as obliged thereby to act lawfully, because of itself from its subjective constitution it can only be determined by the conception of good. Therefore no 'Imperatives' hold for the Divine will or in general for a holy will. 'Ought' is here out of place, because volition is already of itself necessarily in unison with the law." P.31. Abbott's edition.

The bhakta who is also the *jñāni* goes about doing his daily duty "diffusing virtue as a star diffuses its light, and a flower its perfume without even being aware of it." It is here that he gets to the full measure of the stature of Christ, because it is the highest karma.

Chapter 8.

The Goal.

Every religion, even the most primitive has a goal in view. It may be earthly prosperity or heavenly bliss or union with the Divine. These are stages of the goal in the upward development of religion.

The primitive man has very little conception of a life beyond or a life after death. He lives for this world, and if the unseen spirits bless him with material things he is satisfied. The Rg-Vedic religion though not altogether primitive illustrates this point. The people are not very much concerned about the soul and its future. All they wished for was a life of hundred autumns for themselves and their children. R.V. 10:18. But to the thinking minds among them a future life appealed. Even to them the conception of life and death, heaven and hell was very vague. They thought that the persons who died went to the abode of Yama and lived there like shadows. They get to this place by passing over water and a bridge. 10.6.10; 9.41.2. There, they have all joys of earth increased and perfected. It is the portion of those who bestow liberally to gods and priests. They attain immortality and prolong their lives. 1.25.6. Some of them become moon in heaven. 2.2; 10.1.3. Corresponding to heaven there is a hell for the wicked and the evil-doer, the heretic and those who do not believe in gods. Varuna thrusts the evil doer down into the dark abyss from which he never returns. Indra is asked to put to the lower darkness the man who injures his worshipper. 10.132.4; 4.5.5; 9.73.8; 10.152.4.

In the Brāhmaṇas heaven is the reward of those who do sacrifices, plenty of them and in the right way. "He who sacrifices thus obtains perpetual prosperity and renown and conquors for himself a union with the two gods Aditya and Agni and an abode in the same sphere." The doctrine of rebirth also is suggested. The good and the bad alike are re-born in the next world, the good to be rewarded and the wicked to be punished. There is only one life after this and that life is determined by our character here. "A man is born into the world which he has made." Sat. Brāh.

5.2.2.27. See also 12.9.11; 2.6. Re-birth did not mean samsara.

When we put these early conceptions in Hindooism side by side with that of the early Hebrews we find that there is not much to compare. The early Hebrews did not bother very much about future life and immortality. According to the Old Testament, the life of man is primarily physical. With death ^{the} soul ceased to exist. It either departs into the shadowy world of Sheol or according to the more philosophical view of Ecclesiastes, "returns to God who gave it." Therefore, the goal of life is prosperous continuance of bodily existence, "the length of days."

Heaven and hell are mentioned in the Old Testament. The former is used in the sense of skies or as the seat of Yahweh, and the latter as a synonym for sheol. When the Psalmist says, "Thou shalt not leave my soul in hell," "The wicked shall be turned into hell," he means sheol and nothing more. Sacrifices were offered to God either to turn away the consequences of their evil deeds or for material prosperity, but never to gain heaven. There is no suggestion of punishment in hell for the wicked nor bliss in heaven for the good, either temporary or eternal. It is all confined to this life.

Even the prophets of Israel whose conception of religion was much higher than that of their contemporaries, who preached the demand of a righteous God did not try to terrorise their people by the torments of hell or coax them to do good by the bliss they were to enjoy in heaven. If the nation would do good God would bless them. If they would do evil, God would punish them. But either blessing or punishment was a matter of this life and not of the next. Death was the end. "Death cannot celebrate thee. They that go down to the grave cannot hope for thy truth. The living, the living, he shall praise thee as I do this day." Isa. 37.18-19. For all the sufferings of Job, he is not rewarded in the next life but on this earth. "The Lord gave Job twice as much as he had before. So Job died, being old and full of days." 42.10.

It is in the apocalyptic and early Christian literature that we have a developed form of the immortality of the soul and its reward or punishment in heaven or hell. The idea of an eternal heaven and hell was read even into the mind of Jesus by the Synoptic writers. Thus Jesus is made to say, "When the Son of Man shall come in his glory..... say unto them on his right hand ... inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world... say unto them on the left hand, depart from me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire...." Men are rewarded or punished everlasting according to their deeds. Hell is set forth as intolerably painful. It is a perpetual lake of fire burning with brimstone. Rev. 19.20. All the wicked have their part in it. 21.8. It is a dismally dark place, where there is nothing but grief, sadness, vexation, rage, despair, gnashing of teeth etc. Mt.8.12. Their misery is enhanced by the eternity of their punishment.

"Their worm dieth not, and their fire is not quenched." Mk. 9.48.

Likewise, the conception of heaven is that it is a place of supreme and everlasting felicity. There is complete exemption from all evils, sins and their consequences in heaven. The body is revived, and the soul lives in communion with God. Communion with saints and angels is made possible. There is everlasting bliss.

The Mediaeval Christian Church made much use of such conceptions of hell and heaven to persuade people unto good living, and it is no wonder when almost every writer of the New Testament books with the exception of the Fourth Gospel writer and to a certain extent Paul had something of this sort to say about the goal of their life -- a paradise to strive for and a hell to be avoided.

Whatever else we might say about Hindooism, this much is true that we do not find such hideous conception of hell,-- though the hedonic conception of heaven is oftentimes present,-- even in the Rg-Veda and in the Brāhmaṇas. What somebody said about it is very true. "To men of mild disposition and reflective not spirit as the Indians, it would/appear that reward and punishment could be eternal. They would conceive that it must be possible by atonement and purification to become absolved from the punishment of the sins committed in this short life. And in the same way, they could not imagine that the reward of virtues practiced during the same brief period could continue for ever." Hence partly the theory of transmigration.

As we pass from the Rg-Veda and the Brāhmaṇas to the Upanisads, we find a much higher spiritual conception of the goal of life. In Indian thinking, it was the Upanisads that clearly grasped for

the first time the idea of the oneness of human life with the divine life. We have come forth from God and our ultimate goal is God. We notice two main streams of thought in the Upanisads with regard to the goal.

According to one stream of thought, the goal is personal immortality. The liberated soul is a perfect individual having almost an equality with God. Mund. 3.1.3. "Traversing these worlds, having the good he likes, taking the form he likes, he sits singing songs." Tait. 3.10.8. He has the feeling that he is one with God. He has raised himself up to the region of the deity. Chānd. 2.22. He has the companionship of God. Mund. 3.2.6. He has a likeness to God. 3.1.3. Here the individuality of the soul is not done away with. The liberated soul lives a life of unity with God

According to the other stream of thought, the liberated soul is merged in the divine and lose his individuality. "As the flowing rivers disappear in the sea, losing their name and form, thus the wise man, freed from name and form goes to the divine person beyond all." Mund. 3.2.8. See also Prasna 6.5. The finite in us is abolished, and the infinite in us realises its oneness with the infinite Puruṣa. "All these become one in the highest imperishable Brahman." Mund. 3.2.7. He is merged in him. Prasna 4.9. He becomes all, 4.10, enters into everything, Mund. 3.2.5, calls himself the creator of the world. Tait. 3. "The pranava is the bow, the Ātman is the arrow, and the Brahman is said to be its mark. It should be hit by one who is self-collected, and that which hits becomes like the arrow, one with the mark, that is Brahman. Mund. 2.2.2. See also Katha 2.25. In this highest state there is no consciousness of individuality.

It is like a dreamless sleep. Yājanavalkya explains this state with the analogy of the salt dissolved in water.

The Buddhist goal of life is *nirvāna*. There are two kinds of *nirvāna*. One is a dying out of hot passions, extinction of false desire, destruction of the fire of lust, hatred and ignorance. The other is called *parinirvāna*, a complete dying out. Some take it to be complete extinction or annihilation. "The blessed one passed away... in which no root remains." Milinda 3.5.10. Yet to a great many even *parinirvāna* cannot mean absolute extinction. It means absolute perfection or completeness of being, a life beyond the joys and the sorrows of the world. "Final deliverance is declared by the sage Buddha to be nothing other than a flow of faultless states of consciousness." Gotama Buddha most probably meant by *nirvāna*, a positive blessedness, a state of perfection where there is a suppression of all evil tendencies, freedom from stress and conflict and a final release from spiritual struggle.

In discussing the purpose, process and elements of the *Gītā* we found that during the course of its growth and development it added many elements within it. The most important streams of thought among those elements are three, 1. Theism, 2. Monism, 3. Dualism. In discussing the goal we have to take these into consideration, because the conception of the goal in the *Gītā* is determined mainly by these three streams of thought.

Several names are given to the goal of life. These are *Mokṣa* (freedom), *Mukti* (release), *Brāhmaisthiti* (being in Brahman), *Naīkṣarṇya* (non-action), *Nisṭraigunya* (absence of the three qualities), *Kaivalya* (solitary salvation), *Brahmabnāva* (being of Brahman). It is difficult to say which one of these best express the ultimate

goal. We may call them several phases of it. Almost all of them are found in the Gita. But some are not so prominent as the others.

A polytheistic conception is found when Kṛṣṇa says that those who worship the shining ones go to the shining ones.^(7:23) This is the same view of the goal as that of the Vedas and the Brāhmaṇas when they say that those who sacrifice obtain for themselves 'a union with the two gods Aditya and Agni and an abode in the same sphere.' Salvation is provided even for the worshippers of the shining ones. There is also an apocalyptic conception of heaven and hell. Heaven is described as 'that indestructible path' which the devotees 'tread undeluded'. "Nor doth the sun lighten there, nor moon, nor fire; having gone thither they return not; that is my supreme abode." 15.5-6. On the other hand those who are 'enmeshed in the web of delusion, addicted to the gratification of desire, they fall downwards into foul hell.' 16.16. "These haters, evil, pitiless, vilest among men in the world, I ever throw down into demoniacal wombs. Cast into demoniacal wombs, deluded birth after birth, attaining not to me... they sink into the lowest depths." 16.19-20. The Buddhistic conception of the goal also is found in several places though it is mentioned only ^{a few times} by name. "The yogi ever united thus with the self, with the manas controlled, goeth to peace, to Nirvāna." 6.15. "He goeth to the Nirvāna of the Eternal." 2.72. Also, 5.24.

We shall now proceed to examine the main conceptions of the goal in the Gītā. The first of these is theistic.

The ultimate goal is the union with God. The bhakta entereth into God's being. "And he who casting off the body, goeth forth thinking upon me only at the time of the end, he entereth into

my being." 8.5. "Thou shalt come unto me, having me as thy supreme goal." 9.34. "Having come to me, these mahatmas come not again to birth, the place of pain, non-eternal. They have gone to the highest bliss." 8.15. They knoweth birth no more. 8.16. The devotees go to Kṛṣṇa. 7.23. "At the close of many births the man full of wisdom cometh to me; 'Vāsudeva is all,' saith he." 7. 19.

This does not mean that the individuality of the bhaktas ~~is~~ done away with. The freed souls go to God. They have an affinity, nay, union with him. Nevertheless, they are separate individuals. The highest state is not a lāya or disappearance but dwelling in Purusottama(nivasiṣyasi mayyeva). The freed souls act even as Purusottama acts. Action is possible for them. Men of insight and wisdom imitate the Lord and do action.

4.14-15. Those who dwell with and in Purusottama are freed from re-birth. They attain to the status of God(madbhāvam āgatāḥ). 18.21; 4.1a. This does not mean that they become God. They attain to the measure of the stature of God. It is a God-like existence of perfect freedom and blissful state. They attain the sameness of essence with God(mama sādharmyam āgatāḥ). This does not mean that their selves vanish. But they are enlarged and made free of sin, doubt and unwisdom. 6.27. They get rid of rajas and tamas and attain the quality of sattva.

Personal immortality of the soul and its union with God is the goal of theism. The individual who is united with God in bhakti does not desire anything else but this as a reward. Through out the Gītā this goal is prominent though often times obscured by the other goals that we shall discuss presently.

The second main conception of the goal is monistic. There are a number of passages in the *Gītā* where the ultimate goal is shown to be a merging in the absolute Brahman, where we lose our individual consciousness. It looks like a colourless state. It is called siddhi(perfection), prāsiddhi(supreme perfection), parāmgatim(the supreme goal), padam anāmayam(the blissful seat) sānti(quietude), sāsvatam padam avyayam(the eternal indestructible abode). 12.10; 16.23; 14.1; 6.45; 8.13; 9.32; 16.22-23; 2.51; 4.39; 5.12; 18.62; 18.56. It is very doubtful, according to this conception of the goal, whether there is any individuality or quality left for the freed soul. "Crossing beyond the qualities he is fit to become the Eternal." 14.26. "Liberated from the bonds of birth, they go to the blissful seat." 2.51. "That unmanifested, 'the indestructible,' it is called. It is named the highest path. They who reach it return not. That is my supreme abode." 8.21. "That path beyond may be sought, treading which there is no return." 15.4. "Dwelling constantly in the self, desire pacified, liberated from the pain of opposites known as pleasure and pain, they tread undeluded, that indestructible path." 15.5. "When he perceiveth the diversified existence of beings as rooted in One, and spreading forth from it, then he reacheth the Eternal." 13.31. "Seeing indeed everywhere the same Lord equally dwelling, he doth not destroy the self, and thus treads the highest path." 13.20. There is no mention here of a personal immortality or union with the divine being. It is a state of nirguna(without quality). There is no ego and no separate will. It is beyond all modes and qualities, impassive, free, and at peace. It is beyond birth and death, infinite and eternal. The best we can say about it is that it resembles to an eternal

sleep without any dreams or consciousness.

Thirdly, we shall consider the dualistic goal of life in the *Gītā*. This is supplied by the Sāṃkhya. According to the Sāṃkhyā, liberation is the result of discrimination between *prakṛti* and *puruṣa*. Men fail to attain this goal because of *aviveka* or non-discrimination. The *Gītā* says, "He who thus knoweth *puruṣa* and *prakṛti* with its qualities, in whatsoever condition he may be, he shall not be born again." 13.24. "They who by the eyes of wisdom perceive this difference between the field and the knower of the field, and the liberation of beings from matter, they go to the supreme." 13.35. "Children, not sages, speak of the Sāṃkhya and the Yoga as different; he who is duly established in one obtaineth the fruits of both. That place which is gained by the Sāṃkhyas is reached by the Yogis also." 5.4-5. Getting rid of the *gunas* is the Sāṃkhya conception of the goal. "The same in honour and ignominy, the same to friend and foe, abandoning all undertakings -- he is said to have crossed over all qualities(*gunas*). "Liberated from these three *gunas* born of *prakṛti*." 18.40.

An attempt is made to bring the Sāṃkhya goal in touch with the theistic goal of the *Gītā*. This is done through the Yoga. The scheme of thought in the latter is the Sāṃkhya, but it is a theistic and practical development of the Sāṃkhya. What the *Gītā* is trying to tell us is that in the highest reality all the goals are one. The union with a personal God is the same as merging in the impersonal Absolute and the liberation obtained by the discrimination between *puruṣa* and *prakṛti*. This is incomprehensible.

The three ways which we described at length are the ways which lead to the first goal, the goal of theism -- union with a personal God. Neither the thought of merging with a monistic Brahman nor the liberation by discrimination between prakṛti and puruṣa can induce a person to follow those three ways. Theirs is the way of vijñāna or intelligence. It is more metaphysics than religion, more philosophy than spiritual experience. The great incentive for bhakta comes only from the hope of .. union with a personal God which for him is ultimate liberation, final release from samsāra, perfect freedom, blissful ananda, eternal and everlasting life.

The Gītā advises us to follow any one of the three paths to reach the goal. Some times one way is preferred to the others. "Try to know me. Let thy reason enter into me. If you cannot contemplate me practice yoga. If you are not equal to this, try to serve me by dedicating your work to me. Even if this is found hard, do your duty regardless of the consequences, giving up all desire for for fruits." 12.8f. "Better indeed is wisdom than constant practice; than wisdom meditation is better; than meditation, renunciation of the fruit of action; on renunciation follows peace." 12.12. See also, 6.46; 7.16; The way is left to the choice of the individual. "Some by meditation, others by reflection, others by action, others by worship.... pass beyond death." 13.24f. See also 18.54f. The men who follow any one of these paths do not stop with it. It leads on to the others. They take them to the goal.

The Gītā considers the goal not as a far off event. It does not ask the bhaktas to wait till death or till the coming of a day of consummation to be united with the Bhagavān. Yet there

are a few passages that point to this direction. "And he who casting off the body, goeth forth thinking upon me only at the time of the end, he entereth into my being." 8.5. But on the whole the union with the Bhagavān is a reward of the bhakta in this life. "He who established in unity worshippeth me, abiding in all beings, that yogi liveth in me, whatever his mode of living." 6.31. "The yogi who thus, everharmonising the self, hath put away sin, he easily enjoyeth the infinite bliss of contact with the eternal." 6.28. "Becoming the Eternal, serene in the self, he neither grieveth nor desireth." 18.54. "He whose self is unattached to the external contacts and findeth joy in the self, having the self harmonised with the Eternal by yoga, enjoys imperishable bliss." 5.21. "The yogi passeth all these by having known this, and goeth to the supreme and ancient seat." 8.28. "He who is happy within, who rejoiceth within, who is illuminated within, that yogi, becoming the Eternal, goeth to the nirvāna of the Eternal." 5.24.

Thus, it is not necessary for us to wait till we get rid of the body to attain the goal. It is reached here and now on this earth. "To be immortal is to live in the eternal light." The bhakta is in constant union with the Bhagavān. He is lost in his bhakti for him. His whole outlook on life is enlightened by jñāna. Sometimes jñāna itself is considered the goal. Every one of his actions are in harmony with the divine will. He acts even as the Bhagavān acts. He is no more a human self but a divine self. He finds divine energy going through all that is going on in the world. He is not a mere divine agent, but a part of God doing his share of work in the world.

* The conception of the goal in the Fourth Gospel is summed up more or less in the word 'life'. The writer practically starts with 'life'."In Him was life and the life was the light of men." 1.4. He also ends with 'life'. "These are written that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God; and that believing that ye might have life through his name." 20.31.

The writer's conception of the goal is much clearer than that of the *Gita*. Unlike the latter there is only one goal in view and that is life or eternal life through belief in Jesus Christ. "God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten Son that whosoever believeth in him should not perish but have ever-lasting life." 3.16. Unlike the *Gita* again, whatever the writer took from other sources, he made subservient to this one view and experience of the goal -- eternal life.

We have to view this conception of eternal life of the writer in the light of four main influences -- the Old Testament, the Synoptics, the Pauline and the Greek.

In the books of the Old Testament, as we saw before, the conception of the goal of life was primarily material. Death ends all. There is neither an adequate conception of the soul nor of its immortality. Yet there are places in the Old Testament where life is conceived as the life of God. At death it returns to God who gave it (p.123). Man lives on earth by every word of God. Deut. 8.3. "With thee is the fountain of life." Ps. 36.9. Thus the life of man is a part of the life of God. It comes from him and goes back to him.

The conception of goal of the Synoptic writers is much influenced by the apocalyptic ideas of their day. They looked for a day of judgment, a day on which Christ should appear in

all his glory to gather his elect, to send the wicked to eternal punishment, and the faithful to heaven that is prepared for them from the foundation of the world. In very many places heaven and hell are conceived in the regular apocalyptic manner. Yet the spiritual conception of the goal is not absent. "In heaven they neither marry nor are given in marriage, but are like the angels of heaven," is the answer of Jesus to the Sadducees. To ^{the} Jesus of the Synoptics the kingdom of heaven is a spiritual state that is among men and within their hearts. "The kingdom of God is within you."

The Synoptics also describe the goal in terms of life. "This do and thou shalt live." It is better to enter into life halt and maimed." Mt. 18.8; Mk. 9.43. "Narrow is the way that leadeth into life." Mt. 7. 14. "He that findeth his life shall lose it. And he who loseth his life for my sake shall find it." Mt. 10.39.

Paul conceives of the goal in terms of life. This life is in Christ. Christ has already entered into the fulness of life after the resurrection. The believer shares this life of Christ by communion and fellowship with him, nay, by a kind of mystical union with him. "I live, yet not I, but Christ liveth in me. And the life which I now live in the flesh, I live by the faith in the Son of God." Gal. 2.20.

But Paul, like the Synoptic writers, looked for a consummation of life in some future day. Though we are already partly in possession of the life of Christ here on earth, full life would realise itself only in the next world. The life we have here is only a promise and security of the richer life that is to be ours at his second coming. Our real life is hid with Christ in God, and

when he shall appear, then shall we also appear with him in glory. It is then that we get rid of this physical body which is a bondage, a stronghold of sin, a seat of spiritual struggle, and acquire a spiritual body, something like the body of the resurrected Christ.

Therefore, for Paul as for the Synoptic writers, real life begins not here on earth, but after the reappearance of Christ. Nevertheless, such a life is conditioned by our life here through faith in the Son of God.

The writer of the Fourth Gospel follows the conception of the goal of life as life. But he gives up the idea that the goal is to be achieved in some far off day. He does not anticipate a return of Christ like the Synoptic writers or Paul. Christ is already with the believer. But there are a few passages in the Gospel where a day of consummation is expected by the writer. "The hour is coming in the which all that are in the graves shall hear his voice and shall come forth. They that have done good to the resurrection of life and they that have done evil to the resurrection of damnation." 5.28-29. "I will raise him up at the last day." 6.40. Also, 39, 44, 54. In the light of the other passages in the Gospel we have to interpret this as a reflection of the popular idea of the day rather than the writers own idea. Viewing things as a whole, we have to judge that the writer does not look forward to any such far off divine event. In verse 25 of chapter 5 the writer says, "The hour is coming and now is, when the dead shall hear the voice of the Son of God: and they that hear shall live." The attainment of eternal life is something that should take place in the life of the believer on this earth

and continued to eternity. The life in the future world, though admitted, is not considered the beginning of a new state of things. It is a continuation and fulfilment of the eternal and abundant life that has begun on this earth by believing on the Lord Jesus. This is evident from a number of passages. "I am come that they might have life and have it more abundantly." "He that believeth on me is passed from death unto life." 5.24. "I am the resurrection and the life; he that believeth on me though he were dead, yet shall he live; and whosoever liveth and believeth on me shall never die." 11.25-26. Physical death has very little significance for the writer. It is just a natural close of the bodily life. It has nothing to do with real life. The writer speaks of death and life almost always in a spiritual sense. Eternal life starts with our new life in Christ. Nothing, even death, cannot deprive the believer of this new life that he possesses. True resurrection takes place when a man is born again, when he becomes a believer in the Son of God. Though this change is inward and invisible, it is vital and real in that it is the beginning of life which is the eternal life. "He that liveth and believeth on me shall never die." Eternal life is something actual and present and is continued to eternity.

We already discussed the Greek influence on the writer in connection with the passage, "This is life eternal...." (P.104) The Greek influence came directly or through the instrumentality of Philo and Paul. The Greek mind subjected God to a sharp analysis to determine his essential nature. God is self-caused, self-sufficient, pure reason, pure thought, pure intelligence. Aristotle says, "If pure intelligence, as compared with human

nature, is divine, so too will the life in accordance with it be divine compared with man's ordinary life. Wherefore so far as we can we must live the immortal life, looking to the highest principle in us." (Arist. Nic. Eth. 10.6). Again, "Life resides in God, for the energy of thought is life; and this energy as it exists absolutely in God is the best and eternal life." (Metaph. 11.6). God alone is ideally true and perfect. He is fully and wholly that man is in part. According to the Greek thinkers full life of man is conditioned by contemplation and knowledge of this ideal truth of God. For the Gnostics especially real life consisted in knowledge. We find modified forms of the Greek conception in Philo and Paul. Philo, though holding partly a Hebrew conception, thought that our lives attain fulfilment by contemplation and knowledge of God. In Paul we find the statement, "In him we live, move and have our being."

It is in the light of this Greek idea that we have to look at several passages in the Gospel, especially the memorable passage, "This is life eternal, that they might know thee the only true God and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent." The knowledge of God and Christ is considered the goal itself. But in most of the passages it is thought of as the way that leads to the goal. In either case there is nothing in this that is contradictory to the main conception. The knowledge of God which when completed becomes the goal itself. It is spiritual intuition, a direct insight into the life of God, and hence a sharing of that life. We discussed a similar thought in connection with the Gītā. We begin with *jñāna* and end with perfect *jñāna*, a *jñāna* which is divine *jñāna*, which is also a sharing of his life.

We discussed also the significance of the passage, "Ye shall know the truth and the truth shall make you free." The idea of deliverance as a result of the knowledge of truth is very much marked with Greek influence.

We have not yet mentioned the greatest factor that helped to form the writer's conception of the goal. It is to be found in his own personal experience. Though he takes ideas from the Hebrew, early Christian, and Greek sources, he subjects these to his own personal knowledge, conviction and experience. This is where the Gospel differs much from the *Gītā*. The writer of the Gospel has a personal experience and everything is subjected to that experience. He has a conviction and knowledge that God fully revealed himself in Jesus as Life, Light and Truth. In the Gospel, truth and light are commonly associated with **divine** life. That life in its fulness is in Jesus. "In him was life." "As the Father hath life in himself, so hath he given to the Son to have life in himself." The Son imparts this life to the believer. It is the personal experience of the writer. He himself received this life from the Son by means of a mystical union with him. He experienced a full regeneration of his own personality by his contact with Christ. He was 'born again'. The living Christ imparted his life to him, he being the life-giver. By constant fellowship and communion, Christ entered into the heart of the evangelist and he into the life of Christ. "Abide in me and I in you. As the branch cannot bear fruit of itself except it abide in the vine, no more can ye except ye abide in me."

The experience is something more than abiding. It is the assimilation of the life of Jesus by the believer. The real

mystical union is given in semi-physical terms. "Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of Man and drink his blood ye have no life in yourselves." 6.53. "If any man eat of this bread he shall live for ever." Also verses 52-59.

This is life, eternal life, a life of complete union with the living Christ from which nothing can separate the believer. But it is not a union in which the believer has lost his individuality. On the other hand it is a union in which his own personality is perfected by Christ indwelling in him and he in Christ. The believer is already in possession of this eternal life, because he has incorporated his life into the life of Christ and hence into the life of God.

We shall close by summing up the main differences and similarities between the ideal of the goal in the *Gītā* and the Fourth Gospel.

They differ mainly in this, that while in the Fourth Gospel there is only one goal, the conception of the goal in the *Gītā* is divided; that while the Fourth Gospel writer subjects other influences to his own personal experience, the *Gītā* does not show any such tendency; that while the former clearly indicates that the eternal life is spiritually vital in his own experience, the latter lapses into, sometimes a philosophical and metaphysical goal of life.

Nevertheless, the main goal in the *Gītā* is spiritual as it is in the Fourth Gospel. This goal is to be attained through bhakti, *jñāna*, and karma-- belief, knowledge and obedience. *Jñāna* is considered by both sometimes as the goal. Generally they look upon the goal as eternal life. This life is in the

Bhagavān. The bhaktas obtain it even in this life by a mystical union with him. It is continued to eternity. There is no obliteration of individuality. On the other hand, the individuality is perfected through union with God.

Bibliography.

The Bhagavad Gītā.

Texts and Introductions.

The Bhagavad Gītā.....	Annie Besant.
Srimad Bhagavad Gītā.....	Swami Swarūpānanda.
The Bhagavad Gītā.....	C. Johnstone.

Literature.

Kṛṣṇa and the Gītā. (Rāja Sūrya Rāo Lectures).	S. Tattavāḍhūshān.
Bhakti Yoga.....	Swami Vivekananda.
Jñāna Yoga.....	"
Karma Yoga.....	"
Indian Philosophy.....	Radhakrishnan.
Vaisnavism and Śaivism.....	R.G.Bhandarkar.
Sri-Bhāṣya.....	Rāmanujacharya.
Early History of Vaisnavism in India.....	Kṛṣṇa Swami Ayangar.
Indian Theism.....	MacNicol..
Religions of India.....	Hopkins.
India -- What can it teach us?.....	Max Muller.
Hindooism.....	Barnett.
Religions of India.....	A. Barth.
Distinctive Messages of Old Religions.....	Matheson.
Salvation in Hindooism and Christianity..	J.Bilger. (Tr.L.Oehler).
Religion of the Veda.....	Bloomfield.
Vedic Religion.....	K.S.MacDonald.

Outline of the Religious Literature of India.	J.N. Far ⁹ har.
Primer of Hindooism.....	"
Crown of Hindooism.....	"
The Gītā and the Gospel.....	"
Some Leading Ideas of Hindooism.....	H.Haigh.
The Religion of India.....	A.Menzies.
Hindooism -- Past and Present.....	J.M.Mitchell.
Hymns of the Rig Veda.....	A.A.McDonell.
India's Problem -- Kṛṣṇa or Christ.....	Jones.
India and its Faiths.....	J.B.Pratt.
Living Religions of the East.....	S.Cave.
The Thirteen Upaniṣads.....	Hume.
The Rig Veda and the Vedic Religion.....	A.C.Clayton.
The Sacred Books of the East.	Max Müller.
Volumes.	
XII. Sataptha Brāhmaṇa Part 1	
XXVI. " " " 2	
VII. Institutes of Viṣṇu.	
XLVIII. Vedānta Sutras.	
XXXII. Vedic Hymns. Part 1.	
XLVI. " " " 2.	
XXI. The Saddharma Pundarīka.	
VIII. The Bhagavad Gītā.	
X. Dhammapāda.	
I and XV. The Upaniṣads.	
Sacred Books and Early Literature of the East. Vol.9, 10.	
The Story of Buddhism.....	Saunders.
Gotama Buddha.....	"
Buddhism.....	Mrs. Rhys Davids.
Buddhism in Translations.....	Warren.
Buddhist Philosophy.....	Keith.
E.R.E	
Articles., The Upaniṣads.....	A.S.Geden.
"The Opens Court." Religion and Philosophy of Ancient India -- The Bhagavad Gītā or the Song of the Blessed One.....	F. Edgerton.

The Fourth Gospel.

The Fourth Gospel.....	J. R. Scott.
The Historic and Religious Value of the Fourth Gospel.....	"
The Fourth Gospel... Its Significance and Environment.....	R. H. Strachan.
The Fourth Gospel in Research and Debate.....	B. W. Bacon.
The Beloved Disciple.....	A. E. Garvie.
Theology of the Gospels.....	J. Moffat.
Introduction to the Literature of the New Testament.....	"
Introduction to the New Testament.....	A. S. Peake.
The Aramaic Origin of the Fourth Gospel.....	C. F. Burney.
The Origin of the Prologue to St. John's Gospel.....	J. Rendel Harris.
The Gospel according to St. John.....	H. H. Wendt.
An Inquiry into the Character and Authorship of the Fourth Gospel.....	J. Drummond.
The New Testament in the 20th Century.....	M. Jones.
Problems of the New Testament Today.....	R. H. Malden.
Christ and the Eternal Order.....	J. W. Buckham.
The Life of Christ in Recent Research.....	W. Sanday.
The Gospel according to John.....	H. W. Watkins.
Books of the New Testament.....	H. Von Soden.
The Manifold Message of the Gospel..... (The Gospel according to St. John.)	C. M. Stuart. (C. C. McCown)
The Fourth Gospel -- The Heart of Christ....	E. H. Sears.
The Fourth Gospel and the Synoptists.....	F. W. Worsley.
Johannine Theology.....	G. B. Stevens.
The Gospel History and its Transmission.....	F. C. Burkitt.
Mysticism in St. John's Gospel.....	H. A. Watson.

The Doctrine of the Person of Jesus Christ...	H.R. Mackintosh.
The Person and Place of Jesus Christ.....	P.T. Forsyth.
Early Greek Philosophy.....	J. Burnet.
Religious Teachers of Greece.....	J. A. F...
The Message of Jesus According to the Gospel of John.....	J. S. Riggs.
Commentaries.....	A. S. Peake. F. Godet.
Gospel According to St. John.....	B. F. Westcott.
Biblical Essays.....	J. B. Lightfoot.
Johannine Writings.....	P. W. Schmiedel.
The Fourth Gospel.....	E. Schürer.

List of Abbreviations.

Ait.	Aitareya Upaniṣad.
Ār.	Āranyakas.
B. G.	Bhagavad Gītā.
Brih.	Brihad Āranyakā Upaniṣad.
Chānd.	Chāndogya Upaniṣad.
Kat.	Kaṭha Upaniṣad.
Mai.	Maitri Upaniṣad.
Mun.	Mundaka Upaniṣad.
Praś.	Praśna Upaniṣad.
R. V.	Rg-Veda.
Sat. Brāh.	Satapatha Brāhmaṇa.
S. B. E.	Sacred Books of the East.
Śvet.	Śvetasvatara Upaniṣad.
Tait.	Taittirīya Upaniṣad.
Up.	Upaniṣads.





FOR REFERENCE

NOT TO BE TAKEN FROM THIS ROOM

LIBRARY USE ONLY

